



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 2015

No. 10

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
January 21, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM MCCLINTOCK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### PRISONERS ARE BEING RELEASED FROM GUANTANAMO AT AN ALARMING RATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation I introduced last week as a companion piece to a bill offered by Senator KELLY AYOTTE to protect the safety of the United States and its allies and restrict the transfers of detainees from Guantanamo Bay.

Since mid-November, the President and his administration have ramped up

an effort to make good on a campaign promise to increase the number of Guantanamo detainee transfers. Last night during his State of the Union Address, the President reaffirmed his commitment to close this facility once and for all, and he is releasing prisoners at an alarming rate. Twenty-one terrorists have been released just in November alone to foreign countries. This comes at the expense of our own national security.

H.R. 401, the Detaining Terrorists to Protect America Act of 2015, would suspend the transfer of high- and medium-risk detainees and prohibit any detainee transfers to Yemen as well as increase transparency regarding the remaining Guantanamo detainees.

Detainees at GTMO pose a real threat to our national security. When I speak with folks at home, my constituents, moms and dads, and they ask me how safe we really are, this rate of reengagement comes to mind. The U.S. intelligence community reports that the number of former GTMO detainees who reengage in terrorism has steadily increased since 2002.

According to the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, they reported the combined and suspected confirmed reengagement rate of former GTMO detainees has risen to more than an alarming 30 percent. Before we proceed with any more additional transfers, we must ensure the transfer process is further examined and improved.

In order to protect our fellow Americans, we must stop releasing some of the world's most dangerous terrorists, especially given the fact that they are already reengaging in hostilities against the United States and our allies.

This measure would repeal current law that has allowed the administration to transfer prisoners to foreign countries and reduce the population at GTMO down to 127. The bill also would

prohibit transfers of terror suspects to a foreign country if there has been a confirmed case where an individual was transferred from GTMO and engaged in any other terrorist activity.

The bill would also prohibit the transfer of terror suspects considered to be high or medium risk. Some of the most recent transfer detainees fell into those categories.

In addition, this bill would stop the transfer of detainees to Yemen because the country has become a hotbed for terrorist activities. It makes no sense to send terrorists to a country where there is an active al Qaeda network that we know has been engaged in targeting the U.S.

Most importantly, Yemen's branch of al Qaeda, commonly known as AQAP, was founded by former GTMO detainees. Counterterrorism experts have declared AQAP to be al Qaeda's most effective affiliate, posing the greatest danger to the American homeland.

We cannot risk trusting the world's most dangerous terrorists to its most dangerous places, nor should we simply cut them loose in rich, stable countries with no security safeguards in place. We have to ask ourselves today: How much are we really willing to risk with our own national security in our American homeland?

I want to thank Senator AYOTTE for working with me, and I look forward to working with her to advance this legislation. I look forward to continuing our partnership to prevent the release of dangerous terrorists who seek to reengage in terrorism against the U.S. and our allies. This bill ensures our homeland remains safe from those terrorist attacks.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

### CONGRESS CAN LEARN FROM CHERYL STRAYED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The Chair recognizes

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H433

the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last night for the State of the Union address by President Obama, my guest was a Portlander, Cheryl Strayed, the author of the best-selling book, "Wild," who is currently being portrayed on the big screen by Reese Witherspoon. This epic story is about how a young woman, reeling from the loss of her mother and the cascading challenges of her life, undertook a journey 1100 miles along the Pacific Coast Trail. It was 96 days of an amazing struggle, overcoming all sorts of difficulties, adversities, as she helped work out her own challenges and issues.

I invited her because I thought the story that she portrayed, the experience that she had, was an interesting metaphor for the sorts of things that we should be doing here. Perhaps we might be able to come together as a Congress, supporting legislation that would help protect some of those special places that are portrayed in her powerful book and in the excellent movie.

In the course of her visit, another thought has made its way to me as I watched her interact with dozens of young people in a variety of meetings on Capitol Hill, fellow Members of Congress, and many other people who were touched by the story of her journey and it made a profound effect on them. She continues to receive hundreds of emails a day from people who were inspired by that effort and her magnificent book.

It occurs to me that it is an appropriate metaphor for what our challenge is as Members of the 114th Congress, because this, after all, is a 2-year journey on behalf of the American people. The question for us is: If we can struggle with that heavy pack, navigate areas where sometimes the trail is a little obscure, can we put our trust in strangers who help us along this difficult journey? Can we be resolute in putting one foot in front of another on behalf of the American public?

Mr. Speaker, it was a very profound experience to watch those interactions, after having seen the movie, and having been entranced by the book. I am absolutely convinced that this is our moment, our journey into something that doesn't necessarily have to be "Wild," even though there is a roller coaster of legislative activity. I am convinced there ought to be enough common interest, common commitment, common goals that we ought to be able to tease out elements that enable us to be successful in our journey.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that people will reflect on that experience of this young woman who was able to overcome adversity and open up an amazing chapter in her life and beyond. I hope we will be able to do the same for the people we represent.

#### BATTLE OF THE BULGE 70TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind everybody about a real-life story of being outnumbered 10 to 1, a story of courage, will, discipline, suffering, immense sacrifice, and success, a tale of two great militaries, surprise, weather, overwhelming force, and sheer resolve. It is marked with the graves of thousands and exemplifies the struggle for the very future of freedom in our world.

The story ends with the 101st Airborne and Patton's Armor being victorious in January and February of 1945, and I think it is important to recognize the accomplishments of all the units who struggled and suffered greatly under the German siege of a small town in Belgium named Bastogne. This January and the recent December marks the 70th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge.

Most people know of the 101st Airborne, nicknamed the "batting Bastards of Bastogne," and the plight of Patton's Armor, as chronicled in so many stories and movies now burnished into the collective consciousness of our Nation, and rightly so.

However, Mr. Speaker, on this 70th anniversary, I want to remind us of an often untold story of the other heroes of the Battle of the Bulge and the little but critical town of Bastogne. It is a story of the American soldiers of the 28th Division from Pennsylvania, who held at all costs.

In late October to mid-November of 1944, the battle of the Hurtgen Forest was described as a meat grinder. The 28th Division was in a fierce battle with the German 73rd Corps. For the 28th, the battle losses were 248 officers and 5,452 enlisted men. After the battle, the weary division needed a rest.

The Ardennes Forest was thick and seemingly impenetrable. It was known as a quiet sector in which the 28th could reequip, reorganize, and assimilate thousands of new replacements into the ranks while the division rested.

Greatly weakened by the previous battle, the 28th Division was spread out over some 25 miles along a front which was more than double that which was recommended in standard practice by any division at the time.

On the morning of 16 December 1944, the peace was shattered by the opening barrage of the Germans opening up one of the largest displays of artillery bombardment ever, signaling the start of Hitler's last great offensive on the Western Front in World War II.

For the next 4 days, without any sleep, often without food, elements of the 28th Division and their affiliates fought continuously, often until the last bullet and life, to deny the enemy success. It was exceptionally cold, foggy, damp, and, of course, snow cov-

ered, exactly what Hitler had counted on, as the winter would only add to the element of surprise.

The German 5th and 15th Panzer Armies, 6th SS, and 7th Army attacked the U.S. 8th Army in a line between Aachen and Bastogne with a plan to go as close as possible down the seam between American, Canadian, and British forces to split them.

After crossing the Meuse River, the attacking Panzers were to turn north and capture the port city of Antwerp, thus collapsing the supply lines and the alliance.

The timetable established by the German general staff and German high command called for the capture of the entire 28th Division sector early in the morning of 16 December and the capture of Bastogne by the same evening of that day. Bastogne was a major road junction which was needed by the Germans for armor and resupply units.

In the early morning hours of 16 December, the 28th Division received a message telling them to hold at all costs. Keystoneers, as they were known, were dug in and began the slow and painful art of trading space for time, trading space for time and life.

The 110th Regiment was soon surrounded and fought to the last round. From 0530 that morning of the 16th until sometime late in the afternoon of the 18th and early on the 19th in some locations, men of the 110th Infantry Regiment fought and held, giving ground only when forced out, but all the while buying precious time for General Eisenhower to find and move reserves forward from deep inside France.

The other two regimental combat teams of the division, the 109th and 112th Infantry Regiments, did only slightly better. The 110th Regiment stayed in place as they were assigned the center sector of the division. The regiment alone fought elements of five German divisions, of which it was outnumbered at times 7 to 1.

I must abbreviate due to time.

While there are many things that come to mind when we think of the Battle of the Bulge like the 101st Airborne, Patton's Armor, or Easy Company from the Band of Brothers, please also remember the names and places familiar to those others who held at all costs: the 103rd, the 109th, 110th, 111th, 112th of the 28th. These are the echoes of the 28th Division and the men who held at all costs and traded space for time so that the 101st and Patton's Third Army could get into position in time to defeat the German offensive.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, we can learn a lot from these dedicated soldiers who refused to surrender but fought on for what they believed in. I just wanted to remind everyone and to offer my salute to these finest Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind everybody about a real life story of being outnumbered 10 to 1.

A story of courage, will, discipline suffering, immense sacrifice and success. A tale of two great military forces, surprise, weather, overwhelming force and sheer resolve. A story marked with the graves of thousands, and that exemplifies the struggle for the very future of freedom in our world.

The story ends with the 101st Airborne Division and Patton's Armor victorious in January and February of 1945.

We must recognize the accomplishments of all the units that struggled and suffered greatly under the German siege of a small town in Belgium named Bastogne.

This past December 2014 through the end of January 2015 marks the 70th Anniversary of the one of the most significant and deadly battles of World War II—the Battle of the Bulge.

We must also remember the German units and the actions of their Soldiers committed to their nation's cause. We must recount their actions as well—the cause of their leadership, the unfortunate actions that occurred in those desperate hours and learn from that history so that we may never again have to re-endure them.

Most people know of the 101st Airborne (nicknamed the "Batting Bastards of Bastogne") and the plight of Patton's Armor as chronicled in so many stories and movies now burnished into the collective consciousness of our Nation—and rightly so. However Mr. Speaker, on this 70th Anniversary, I'm reminded of an often untold story of other heroes of the Battle of the Bulge, in the little but critically important town of Bastogne. It's the story of the American Soldiers of the 28th Division from Pennsylvania who held at all costs.

In late October to mid-November of 1944, occurred the Battle of the Huertgen Forest—described as "the meat grinder"—where the 28th Division fought a fierce and deadly battle with the German 73rd Corps. For the 28th, battle losses were 248 officers and 5,452 enlisted men, after which the battle-weary Division needed a rest and were moved to the Ardennes Forest, thick and seemingly impenetrable but quiet sector in which the 28th Division could reconstitute, reorganize and assimilate thousands of replacements into the ranks while the Division recovered. Greatly weakened by the previous battle, the 28th Division was spread out over some 25 miles along a front more than double that which was recommended in standard practice by any division at the time. On the morning of 16 December 1944, the peace was shattered by the opening barrage of the Germans in one of the largest and most deadly artillery bombardments ever—signaling the start of Hitler's last great offensive on the Western Front in WWII. For the next four days without any sleep, and often without food, elements of the 28th Division and their Allies fought tirelessly—to the last bullet in most cases—as well as to the last life, to deny the enemy success.

The day and night were punishing—freezing, wet, foggy and snow-covered—exactly what Hitler had counted on, as the winter would only add to the element of surprise and exponentially increase his chances for success. The German 5th and 15th Panzer Armies, 6th SS and 7th Army attacked the U.S. 8th Army and aligned between Aachen and Bastogne with a plan to fight as close as possible down the seam between American, Canadian and British forces in order to split

them. After crossing the Meuse River, the attacking Panzers were to turn north and capture the port city of Antwerp, thus collapsing the supply lines and the Alliance. The timetable established by the German General Staff and High Command called for the capture of the entire 28th Division sector early in the morning of 16 December, and the capture of Bastogne by the same evening. Bastogne was a major road junction that was needed by the Germans for armor and resupply units.

In the early morning hours of 16 December the 28th Division received the order to "Hold at all costs!"

"Keystoners", as they were known, were dug in and began the slow and painful art of trading space and lives for time—time enough for the 101st Airborne and Patton's Armor to get into the fight, and win it.

The 110th Infantry Regiment soon was surrounded and fought to the last bullet. From 0530 hours on 16 December, until sometime late in afternoon of the 18th and early on the 19th in some locations, men of the 110th Infantry fought and held—giving ground only when forced out—but while buying precious time for General Eisenhower to find and move reserves forward from deep inside France.

The other two Regimental Combat Teams of the Division—the 109th and 112th—did only slightly better, and the 109th ran out of ammunition on the 18th. These scattered and battered units of the 28th Division held out in the face of overwhelming odds—delaying the Germans as long as they was by any standard a miraculous feat because of the complete and massive confusion of the Battle.

However, the 110th Regiment stayed in place as they were assigned the center sector of the Division. This Regiment alone fought elements of five German divisions, outnumbering the Americans 7 to 1.

Overall the 28th Division would identify elements of 9 divisions in its sector before the Battle was over. Early on, the force ratios reached 10 to 1 in the Germans' favor, but still Pennsylvania's 28th Division valiantly held its ground.

Small determined units, low on ammunition, food, water, anti-tank weapons, and morale, continued to stand and fight until forced to retreat, captured or killed.

The old 110th, which had served the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Nation since 1873, started to fight with just over 2200 Soldiers. When all was said and done, less than 750 officers and men could be found still fighting. Some unit strength reports have it just around 500 unit members still standing. The German Fifth Panzer Army was so ravaged by the Keystoners that many say it ultimately cost the Germans the battle.

The Division held until it could hold no more, and it never ordered a single retreat. It was a continuous fighting withdraw under fire—described as "We made the Germans pay for every yard, every road junction, and fighting house by house, floor by floor, often hand-to-hand when the ammunition ran out."

The 28th inflicted 11,700 casualties on the enemy at a cost of 3850 Americans killed and wounded, and another 2000 captured when they simply ran out of ammunition.

There are many footnotes to this intense Battle:

On 17 December, Allied prisoners of war were executed in cold blood by elements of the 6th SS Panzer Army. Some 100 prisoners

were killed where they stood at Malmédy on direct orders from German Colonel Joachim Peiper.

On 19 December, 6000 Allied Troops surrendered to the encircling German Army at Schnee Eifel.

On 20 December, the 101st Airborne Division at Bastogne completely was encircled by the German 47th Panzer Corps and the US 10th and 19th Armored Divisions completely were encircled by the German advance. After holding on to Bastogne for a full week while encircled, the 101st repelled the final German thrust with the arrival of the 4th Armored Division.

On 25 December, the 2nd Panzer Division was stopped by a combined force of British and American armor made up of General Montgomery's 29th Armored Brigade and the American 2nd Armored Division.

7 February 1945 marked the end of the battle where the German casualty count was a staggering 82,000 men, matched only by the 77,000 casualties suffered by the American Army.

While many things come to mind when we think of the Battle of the Bulge—like the 101st, Patton's Armor or Easy Company (made famous by the book and movie, "Band of Brothers"), please also remember the names and places familiar to the others that held at all costs:

The 103rd, 109th, 110th, 111th, 112th Infantry Regiments; the towns and grounds of Clervaux, Wilt, the Clerf River, Foy and Noville; and the other units like Combat Command B, 48th Armored Field Artillery, Combat Command R, 158th Engineer Battalion, 630th Tank Destroyer Battalion, 1278th Engineer Battalion and the 299th Engineer Battalion who suffered and fought to reconstitute and support this brave endeavor. These are the echoes of the 28th Division and the men and units who held at all costs and traded space for time so that the 101st and Patton's 3rd Army could get into position in time to defeat the German offensive.

Mr. Speaker, we could learn so much from these dedicated Soldiers who not only refused to surrender, but fought for what they believed in.

I remind us all of this tale of heroism, tireless and selfless service, and salute these brave Americans.

#### MAINTAINING AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the prior gentleman's commendation of those who fought on behalf of liberty at the Battle of the Bulge. We bow before them. They bequeathed liberty to this generation. It is a heavy burden. Let us hope that we can measure up to it in tribute to their valor.

At last night's State of the Union Address, passing a transportation and infrastructure bill to repair America and build forward a new century, as we create hundreds of thousands of jobs, got the broadest bipartisan applause. You could hear it on both sides of the aisle. So I come to the floor this morning to

say, Let's do it. Let's do it. Chairman BILL SHUSTER and Ranking Member PETER DEFAZIO are two Members who can get us there. We want to help them. I know the majority of Members feel that way. So my words to them are: Onward, gentlemen; lead America forward by passing that bill through us.

On another front, I rise to express deep dismay at what I believe to be Republican efforts to weaken and begin dismantling the Social Security and disability insurance program that so many Americans depend upon. The headline in yesterday's Politico reads: "Social Security disability under attack by the GOP."

As this Congress starts, Republicans have quietly and without consulting Democrats tucked into the rules of this House a point of order provision that aims to harm our Nation's 8,950,000 disabled citizens and weaken the related Social Security earned benefit program. The number of Americans on disability today in a Nation of over 310 million people amounts to less than 3 percent of our population. That is actually a very small number when you think about it. God has been good to most of us, but that isn't true physically and mentally with many of our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, even though the number of disability approvals has been declining since 2010, Republicans have begun this Congress by singling out the disabled. They haven't targeted Wall Street moguls who brought our economy down and stole trillions of dollars of home equity and the very homes from our families. No, Republicans are targeting the injured, the suffering, and those not able to fend for themselves. Even to touch this subject so callously is a cruelty. It causes worry and trepidation. It makes life more uncertain.

Why should such an important change not be debated on this House floor? Republicans instead hope to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people by hiding it in an obscure rule that was part of a massive parliamentary package for this 114th Congress. But I tell you what, not all Americans have been fooled. Despite this subtle attempt to pit Social Security pensioners against disabled beneficiaries, our office has already received a great number of calls and letters from citizens sick over the possibility that a 20 percent benefit cut could adversely affect our neighbors and relatives most in need.

These proposed cuts in Social Security and disability insurance—and I underline the word "insurance"—set the stage for what Republicans truly want, and I fear: severe cuts, a weakened Social Security system, and ultimately dismantling one of our greatest American legacies, earned Social Security benefits and earned disability benefits for our old, our ill, and our disabled. Our disabled and senior citizens have the right to live out their lives with

dignity. And for so many, their lives are not easy.

I remind my colleagues who visit nursing homes and who have neighbors or relatives in their own family who endure pain every day how vital these programs are. There but for the grace of God go you.

This Congress should oppose these backhanded cuts, and at the same time we should support the passage of the transportation and infrastructure jobs bill to build our Nation forward. There are items we can agree on, and there will be items that we disagree on. But our roads, our bridges, our harbors, our airports, our rail systems, the St. Lawrence Seaway System, and navigable waters all deserve our attention. We can make it happen this year. Let's do it.

[From POLITICO, Jan. 20, 2015]

#### REPUBLICANS TARGET SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY

(By David Rogers)

Like Mrs. O'Leary's cow, House Republicans kick-started a bigger fire than many imagined with an opening day rules change that revived Social Security as a hot issue for this Congress—and the 2016 presidential elections.

The GOP's immediate target is Social Security's sprawling disability insurance program, which has grown at a pace far beyond its revenues and will exhaust its trust fund reserves by December 2016, threatening a 19 percent cut in benefits.

In the past, Congress has simply shifted revenues from Social Security's larger retirement account to fill holes in the disability fund. But the new House rule throws up a roadblock by creating a point of order against any such bill that does not improve the "actuarial balance" of the combined funds.

"What we want to do is not kick the can down the road anymore," said Rep. Sam Johnson (R-Texas), who promoted the change as chairman of the Social Security panel on the House Ways and Means Committee. "The rule is intended to get the Congress to at least take a first step toward solving the Social Security problem. If we continue the way we are, it's a go-broke operation."

"If all they're doing is rob-Peter-to-pay-Paul, that's going to be subject to a point of order, and rightly so in my opinion," added Rep. Thomas Reed (R-N.Y.). "We have to protect the retirement fund and the retiree."

It all sounds like "good government," but the politics are rich.

House Democrats were not consulted on the rules change, and liberals accuse the GOP of trying to cull the weak from the herd, pitting the disabled against pensioners to undermine the larger Social Security coalition.

In fact, the new rule's fine print leaves an escape hatch for Republicans to move tens of billions into the disability fund if this gambit fails. Still, the upshot could be a one-two punch Democrats most fear: a first-round debate over disability funding in 2016 followed by a bigger battle over all of Social Security in 2017, when Republicans hope to control both Congress and the White House.

"They're looking for a new weapon," said Michigan Rep. Sander Levin, the ranking Democrat on Ways and Means. "What they're doing in this rule is to use any problems within disability as a way to attack the whole system. It's dangerous doubletalk when they have been the problem, not the answer."

Adding to Levin's fears was testimony last week before Ways and Means, in which Harvard economist Martin Feldstein promoted the idea of Congress gradually raising the eligibility age for full Social Security benefits to as high as 70. That would increase labor-force participation among people older than 65, expanding the economy, Feldstein said. But raising the retirement age would add to the strain on the disability fund, which has had to cover more workers longer since the retirement age was raised from 65 to 67.

These tensions fueled a separate uproar last week over remarks by 2016 presidential hopeful Sen. Rand Paul about the disability program.

Testing the waters in an appearance in New Hampshire, the Kentucky Republican suggested that half the people on Social Security disability had no more to worry about than achy backs and anxiety in the morning. "Join the club. Who doesn't get up a little anxious for work and their back hurts," Paul said disparagingly.

After video of his remarks went online, Paul quickly backtracked: "We absolutely should take care of those truly in need of help," he said in a statement.

At this stage, the White House and Treasury show no sign of backing down from their intent to pursue a straight reallocation of funds from the retirement account, formally known as the Old Age Survivors Insurance or OASI trust fund. Given all the divisions already in Washington, adding a new procedural hurdle is "unhelpful," an administration official said icily.

Indeed, transfers between the two Social Security funds have gone on for years. Each relies on a percentage of the same payroll tax, and the disability program helped the retirement trust fund in the 1980s by reducing its own share of the tax revenue.

What's most changed now is that critics are singling out the disability fund as the profligate partner—and a harbinger of bad times ahead for all.

Without doubt, the growth of the disability program has been explosive.

In the past 20 years, the number of workers getting disability payments has more than doubled to 8.95 million last month. About \$140 billion went out the door in fiscal 2013, double what the costs were just 10 years before. And like food stamps in the Farm Bill debate, disability payments are common enough now to be a whipping boy for conservatives like Paul, playing on resentment toward people receiving government aid during hard economic times.

At one level, this is all political catnip for Democrats, eager to be seen as defenders of Social Security and its New Deal heritage. But given their history, Republicans don't come to the table with clean hands.

For example, the GOP's 2011 budget deal with President Barack Obama held out the promise of millions in appropriations to help the Social Security Administration fight precisely what Republicans complain about in the disability program: medical fraud. But for 2012 and 2013, House Republicans failed to approve the money, thereby adding to Social Security's woes.

Moreover, an analysis by Social Security's chief actuary, Stephen Goss, suggests there's less to the new House rule than meets the eye. That's because the point of order is triggered only if lawmakers exceed a "0.01 percent" threshold, which equates to a \$38.6 billion cap on what any one Congress can move from the retirement fund, Goss told POLITICO.

That leaves too little room for some long-term, multiyear reallocation of payroll tax revenues but it is enough to get past 2016, by Goss' calculations.

"We're projecting [disability] trust funds will be depleted in December of 2016. . . . The shortfall for the ensuing 12 months would come to about \$29 billion," Goss said. "What that means is that we could have a tax rate reallocation that could apply in 2016 or 2016 and 2017 that would generate up to \$30 billion or even \$35 billion transferred to the [disability] trust fund, which would at least extend its reserve depletion date for one more year."

It's a stop-and-go scenario that serves neither party's goals in the end. Much depends in the interim on Johnson and new Ways and Means Committee Chairman Paul Ryan (R-Wis.).

Ryan has boasted that Ways and Means will be "command central" for the GOP's agenda, and he has installed his own staff in Johnson's Social Security subcommittee. In the previous Congress, the disability debate among Republicans was shaped by flamboyant personalities such as the now-retired Sen. Tom Coburn (R-Okla.) and Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.), who has had to surrender his platform as chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. But now, Ryan would like to be the architect for reforms in the social safety net.

There is room for compromise. The crisis is no surprise—as long ago as 1995, Social Security's actuaries were predicting 2016 as a breaking point for the disability fund. And multiple academic papers from the center-left and center-right outline changes Congress could consider.

Three potential areas of agreement: First, find a dedicated source of money for Social Security to expedite so-called continuing disability reviews, which have been shown to generate savings. Second, limit recipients' "double-dipping" among disability and other government benefits. And third, experiment with ways to help people with disabilities to stay in the workforce or return more quickly.

The past year has seen some turnaround on funding for the disability reviews. In the fiscal 2014 and 2015 Social Security budgets, House Republicans finally agreed to the extra "program integrity" appropriations that the budget deal had called for. The Social Security Administration says every dollar spent here can lead to \$9 in long-term savings, and in 2013—the latest year for which data are available—more than 17,000 workers were disqualified as a result of these medical reviews.

The administration estimates that as many as 790,000 continuing disability reviews will be conducted this year, a 50 percent increase over 2014 and double the annual average from 2009–2013. To maintain this effort, the 2016 budget that Obama proposes in February is expected to ask again for close to the \$1.4 billion provided in 2015.

The White House is also expected to come back to Congress with a set of demonstration programs to test and gather data on the effectiveness of early intervention—with workers and employers—rather than individuals simply surrendering to going on disability. The omnibus bill approved in December provided \$35 million for this purpose, far less than what the administration had hoped for.

"I think it's clear that the system needs to be improved," said Jeffrey Liebman, a Harvard professor who served in the Office of Management and Budget during Obama's first term. "I also think it's clear that we don't yet know enough about the cost and benefits of specific proposals to make wholesale changes."

Part of the challenge for policymakers is the unique nature of disability insurance.

Unlike many other disability programs, Social Security's covers only total dis-

ability—not partial or short term. Benefits are a function of how much a worker previously earned and put into the system, but on average these run under \$1,200 per month. On top of this, a worker is allowed to earn some outside income, but this is capped at less than \$1,100 a month.

The result is that many households can be locked in at 200 percent of poverty or lower once the decision is made to go on disability. That's why early intervention can help both the government and the worker. But how early to intervene—and at what cost—remain big questions.

"They are really only biting at the outer edges of the issue. Their idea of early intervention is way too late," said Richard Burkhauser of Cornell University and the University of Melbourne. Burkhauser argues that the U.S. must look to European countries like the Netherlands that "have really done major things that have fundamentally altered their system."

The Dutch model, for example, requires employers to cover more of the first two years of disability costs, thereby encouraging more management involvement in trying to help employees rehabilitate themselves and stay in the workforce. Yet selling this to a pro-business Republican Congress may take more than a little doing.

"The Dutch still spend more of [gross domestic product] than we do on disability benefits," Liebman said. "They came from spending a lot more than we do to spending more than we do."

Johnson is certainly not eager for big new expenditures. But for all his famous crustiness, the Texas conservative was not unsympathetic to people who depend on the current system.

"We want to work to protect the disability program, but we want to consider how to help those who can and want to work," Johnson said. "And those who can or want to work ought not to be sentenced to a lifetime of near poverty with no way out."

For all the partisanship now, the disability insurance program was born in the mid-1950s under a Republican president, Dwight Eisenhower. Ronald Reagan triggered bitter fights 25 years later when he sought cuts in the early 1980s. That sparked a backlash from Democrats in Congress, which led to changes making it easier for more people to qualify.

But the enrollment numbers really took off in the mid-1990s, as more baby boomers moved into their late 40s and began applying during an otherwise strong economy. The Great Recession accelerated this trend as workers turned to disability as a last resort after unemployment benefits ran out. But the prime mover for the past 20 years has been demographics—changes set in motion generations ago.

These include not just the baby boom, but the fact that women have worked long enough now to qualify for disability benefits. All this comes, most importantly, at a time when the drop in birth rates has left fewer younger workers to help absorb the costs.

If all these forces make disability insurance the black sheep now, it will soon have company: The retirement side of Social Security is feeling the same forces, while new enrollment numbers suggest the spike in disability has peaked. Data show a steady drop in the number of new disability awards since their high in 2010.

"The increasing effects of [disability insurance] are over. We're done with that," Goss said. "The bad news is now the boomers are moving to the higher ages and once they get there, they'll have the lower-birth-rate generation below them. . . . This is unfortunately kind of like the tide."

As the waters recede, rural low-income states like Kentucky, Arkansas, Mississippi

and Maine face a larger concentration of disability cases as a percentage of the population. Workers complain of a slow, almost Dickensian application process that can put their lives on hold for months. This same environment can attract aggressive attorneys, who boast in phone book ads that this is their briar patch—just call.

Fresh indictments this past week in Puerto Rico are a reminder of the risk of fraud—and collusion among doctors, lawyers and administrative judges. Government Accountability Office reports have raised questions about workers double-dipping, by stringing together payments from Social Security disability along with jobless benefits or non-combat-related disabilities covered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

None of this alters the 2016 deadline.

"The trust fund programs really are special because they cannot borrow. The reserves deplete. Congress has to act," Goss said. "We'll still have revenue come in, but our projection is we'll only have 81 cents of tax revenue coming at that time for every dollar of benefits."

But under the new House rule, Goss said, any single piece of legislation can give the program at most "a one-year or slightly more than a one-year extension of the reserve depletion date."

Does that mean Congress should do more than one year?

The actuary chuckled. "The good news," he said, "is that given we have 535 members of Congress, we'll hear lots of arguments and that will likely be one."

#### ENDING THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues would agree that we have many needs in our districts. For example, my district has an inlet that cannot be dredged, which causes an economic problem. And the reason it cannot be dredged is because of lack of funds. We continue to spend billions of dollars in Iraq and Afghanistan, but there is no money for necessary infrastructure projects back here in North Carolina and across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have been outspoken on the continuation of war in Afghanistan. I would like to recite a segment from Rudyard Kipling's poem, "Epitaphs of the War," as Ron Paul did when we went into Iraq: "If any question why we died, tell them because our fathers lied."

Mr. Speaker, a recent letter to the editor of the Marine Corps Times echoed the same sentiment. Bryan Chou wrote:

"Remember the part I said about ending the Marines' presence in Afghanistan? I lied," said every politician.

I assume Mr. Chou was referring to the President's recent statement that the war in Afghanistan is over.

How can the war be over when we just committed to a 10-year bilateral security agreement with Afghanistan to keep thousands of troops there while spending millions of dollars? The Afghan Parliament voted on the bilateral security agreement while we in Congress had no discussion and no debate.

According to the Constitution, the President does not need to come to Congress for permission on an agreement, but I think we have a responsibility to the American taxpayer and our men and women in uniform to discuss an agreement that will keep more taxpayer dollars and more troops in Afghanistan in the coming years.

Just a couple of weeks ago the Marine Corps announced that the marines at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina's Third District, which I represent, are getting ready to deploy to Afghanistan. When does it end, Mr. Speaker? When does it end?

I would like to quote Grant Filbeck from Erie, Pennsylvania, who wrote a letter to the Marine Corps Times last week about Afghanistan:

I believe in the mission 100 percent, but we have given the Afghans the tools to succeed, and it's up to them to use them. We have been in the country for more than 13 years. That is ridiculous. We have spent so much money funding these guys. If the Afghans want to fight for their country, then they will, or the Taliban will take over without much of a fight.

These two men whose letters I referenced are marines who have been to Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, this is a poster from a book titled, "How U.S. Taxpayers Bankroll the Taliban." It was written several years ago by Douglas Wissing. It is a great expose on how the taxpayers' money ends up in the hands of the Taliban, to kill Americans and to blow up the buildings that we built for them with taxpayer money.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, we owe it to the American people, our military, and our Constitution to debate war. As James Madison wrote: "The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature." I agree with James Madison and urge the Congress to meet its constitutional duty to debate war and not let any President have an AUMF to send our young men and women overseas to die and see the taxpayers' money wasted.

May God continue to bless our troops, and may God continue to bless America.

#### A SQUANDERED OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep disappointment in the address by the President last night in this Chamber.

Twenty years ago, President Clinton was in a similar position. He realized his policies weren't working; they had just been overwhelmingly rejected by voters and he faced the first Republican Congress in 40 years. So in his State of the Union Message 20 years ago, President Clinton changed course, proclaiming: "The era of Big Government is over." And he made good on

that proclamation. He reached across the aisle to the Republican Congress, and together they achieved some amazing things for the American people.

Together, they reduced Federal spending by a remarkable 4 percent of GDP. They reformed entitlement spending—in Bill Clinton's words, "ending welfare as we know it." They approved what amounted to the biggest capital gains tax cut in American history. They produced the only four balanced budgets that we have seen in 50 years.

And the economy blossomed. We enjoyed one of the longest periods of economic expansion in our Nation's history.

It wasn't a bipartisan lovefest. They clashed bitterly on matters great and small. Yet their accomplishments produced prosperity for our Nation and ensured President Clinton's popularity that endures to this day.

President Obama thus has a working, proven model to salvage the last 2 years of his failed Presidency, and instead, he is squandering it. The President says he wants to sock it to the wealthy by placing new and heavy taxes on investment. But the simple truth of the matter is, when you tax something, you get less of it. When you tax investment, you get less investment at precisely that time when our economy desperately needs greater investment for more and better-paying jobs.

A smaller percentage of our people are working today than at any time in more than 30 years. Until last year, median family income had fallen throughout this administration. The American people don't want more government handouts. They need more jobs and better jobs, and that means more investment, not less. They need a job market that isn't flooded with millions of illegal immigrants undercutting their wages and opportunities. Indeed, it was recently estimated that the number of illegal immigrants working in direct defiance of Federal law is as much as the net increase in jobs throughout this administration. Most Americans are not getting ahead.

We now suffer the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world, and American businesses are fleeing from it.

Who would have thought that socialist Sweden would today be considered a tax haven compared to the United States? Our people need those American jobs back in America.

Yet the President seeks to raise taxes still further at a time when the Federal Government is already extracting record tax revenues from our people. The percentage of our economy now consumed by Federal taxes is well above the 40-year average. Our economic problems are not the fault of taxpayers for not paying enough taxes.

The President says he wants to help the middle class, but the proposals he set before us last night would drag the middle class still further down the

dark road of debt and doubt and despair that we have been on. If higher taxes and more burdensome regulations were the path to prosperity, we should be enjoying a new economic golden age today. If higher government spending and soak-the-rich policies were the antidote to income inequality, we should today be enjoying an egalitarian paradise.

The reality is these policies have never worked. They have suppressed what should have been a robust economic recovery. They have increased the economic inequalities in our society. They have buried our children under a mountain of debt that will stalk them for the rest of their lives.

The answer to income inequality and economic stagnation is genuine economic growth that requires reducing the burdens that government has placed on our economy. It worked when Bill Clinton did it, when Ronald Reagan did it, and when John F. Kennedy did it. In fact, Kennedy was right: a rising tide lifts all boats. Yet Barack Obama clings obstinately to the opposite policies. It shouldn't surprise us that he is getting the opposite results.

□ 1030

He had a fleeting opportunity last night to bend to the will of the voters, reverse these policies, and redeem his place in history. Instead, Whittier's words seem appropriate this morning:

Of all sad words of tongue or pen, this saddest are these: "It might have been."

#### HONORING WILLIAM M. ALLEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, this past December, the community of Pinellas County, Florida—indeed, the Nation—lost an American hero, William M. Allen.

Bill Allen was 83 years old and had served in the United States Army from 1949 to 1953 as a sergeant, Charlie Company, 19th Infantry Regiment, 24th Infantry Division.

Mr. Allen was a prisoner of war from January 1, 1951, until August 1953, held captive during the Korean war after being overcome by Chinese troops. Mr. Allen was just 19 years old at the time.

To those who knew Mr. Allen, he was one of those remarkable people that left a lasting impression on you after just a single encounter. He was a patriot. He would share his stories not for his own attention, but to impart on each of us the story of sacrifice that our men and women in uniform make so that the United States—all Americans—might live in peace, protected by those who serve.

Mr. Allen's story was most human. In his own words, he wrote this about his enlistment in the Army and subsequent deployment:

Then there are people like myself, the little guy who went to Korea as a young kid, still wet behind the ears, fresh out of high



school, who joined a peacetime army, but soon found himself in one of this country's most controversial military and political situations known at that time.

When it was over, we came home as veterans; no longer were we the kids down the street. We were now that guy home from war, the war that only a very few knew very much about, a war that was unpopular, and a war that was soon to be forgotten, forgotten only by those who didn't have to fight it.

Mr. Allen did fight that war for us, and his sacrifice truly became real the day he knew he had been overcome by Chinese forces. He recalls wondering at that very moment would they shoot him, and in those brief moments, Mr. Allen recalled that he knew then that the course for his life would forever change. Two things he said he knew for sure: one, he was still alive; and, two, he was now a prisoner of war.

Indeed, the course of Mr. Allen's life had changed forever. He endured many terrible moments as a POW. His family endured much grief, much worry, much pain; but his life had also changed forever because Mr. Allen would later find another calling in life, that of teaching others the importance of service, teaching about the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform, sharing with others the true cost of freedom.

He would share these lessons with anyone he would encounter, but he also did something very special. He contributed many of his personal items from the war—letters, telegrams, newspaper articles—to the Armed Forces History Museum in Largo, Florida, for a permanent display dedicated to his POW story. Moreover, he then volunteered his time to teach young people at the museum the very lessons of service, to share with visitors his deeply personal story.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Allen served our Nation in war, but he then served his community here at home, passing down a rich legacy to generations that follow. I was one of those individuals who had an opportunity to share in that story, and I am blessed by my experiences with Mr. Allen.

For his military service, Mr. Allen was awarded many medals, including the Combat Infantry Badge, the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, and others.

Mr. Allen is survived by his wife, Helen, of whom he once wrote:

If she was not with me, I don't know what I would have done. She was not only my wife, but she is my best friend.

Mr. Allen is also survived by his children, Susan and Bill, and many grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, before Mr. Allen's passing, he presented me with a copy of his book, "My Old Box of Memories," and inscribed on the inside jacket is his message, "Freedom is not free." Indeed, we know freedom is not free.

Today, I rise to remember and honor Mr. Allen, to remember and honor his legacy, a legacy that will live on through the many people he has touched and, most importantly, through individuals, children, and

youth that he devoted his time to educating about the cost of war, the importance of sacrifice, and the dignity of service.

I thank Mr. Allen today for his service to our Nation and to pay a most fitting tribute, that for a man who sacrificed so much on behalf of our Nation, today is remembered in the well of this House—the people's House—by Members of Congress and by a grateful Nation.

May God bless Bill Allen; may God bless his wife, Helen; may God bless his family; and may God richly bless each and every American who today serves and protects and defends the United States of America.

#### RESTORE AN OPPORTUNITY GOVERNMENT THROUGH RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, last night, we gathered here in the House of Representatives for a great American tradition: the State of the Union—the Presidential address where we celebrate openness and transparency in our government, where a vision is laid out that we are free to disagree with or agree with components of but, nonetheless, points to this great American ideal that we are a people who self-govern and that we are accountable in an open way to the people who sent us here, even in the midst of deep philosophical divides about the direction of our Nation—and, of course, the world was watching.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important, though, that we take a moment of reflection and be honest about this moment in time and the current conditions in our society. Many Americans do face downward mobility, stagnant wages, and an increased cost of living.

Many people feel very abandoned in the face of a Washington-Wall Street axis, where more and more power is concentrated into fewer and fewer hands. But I think we have to be careful about something. We have to be careful about seeing the solution as lying in more government.

I think our Nation deserves a smart and effective government, and I think our job here in Congress is to continue in an open way, look at the past, and see what worked and see what doesn't work, to let go of that which is tired and old and worn out and continues to linger, and to invest more in that which is smart and effective and can truly build a good society that creates opportunity for all.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that we shouldn't divide ourselves by class and income and that, in a healthy economy, it is one that is focused on small business. This is where most new jobs are created in our country.

Particularly for young people, I think we need to create a culture of

creativity, one in which a person who has an idea can seize the moment and use the gifts of their own two hands and their own intellect to make good things, to create benefit for others, to create jobs, hire people, protect families, and to make a contribution to society.

Many young people want to pursue these avenues; yet we have to be honest about what is happening. We are entering, in this country, into an entrepreneurial winter. What does that mean? In other words, the number of startup businesses—small businesses—is less than the number of small businesses dying.

We do not have a net increase in the number of small businesses; and, again, this is where most Americans live and work, making good things for others, in small business. That is where jobs are created.

How do we address this problem? Well, the tendency, again, in our body is to think about public solutions, but let's examine—not through my opinion but just the analytics—as to why small businesses are not creating new jobs and are not starting up as aggressively as they have in the past.

It is really two things. It is health care and regulations. Smart regulations are necessary to protect the health and well-being of all Americans, but when you have oppressive regulations that tend to stack the deck toward those who are larger and can hire an army of lawyers and accountants, it represses the ability of small businesses to take risks and create jobs.

The second problem we have is health care. Mr. Speaker, I got an email yesterday from someone who said: "Congressman, my health care has gone up so much that I have to move into government housing." Now, think of the irony of that.

Again, we need the right type of health care reform, one that is going to reduce costs and improve health care outcomes while we protect vulnerable persons. But what has happened? Some people have been helped by the new law, but many, many families have been hurt with escalating health care costs, and, again, it creates an environment in which small business is repressed.

Mr. Speaker, again, I think our government should be smart and effective, and I think that is what most Americans want, but Washington continues to remain mired in mediocrity, and political dysfunction and partisan gridlock have made smart and proper government difficult.

This arthritic recovery has dimmed the financial prospects of too many individuals who, again, have stagnant wages or who have given up hope and feel directionless, isolated, and alone. We can do better, and we must do better.

Despite these challenges, I believe the start of a new Congress is an exciting time to renew our government and this promise of our Nation. I would like

to say this, Mr. Speaker: there is nothing wrong in America that can't be fixed by what is right in America, but it is going to require bold resolve, innovative public policy, and a return to our highest ideals.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

Most Reverend Richard Pates, Bishop of the Diocese of Des Moines, Des Moines, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Blessed are You, Lord God of all creation. You bless us with life. You fill each lengthening day with more light, a generous light which shines on all people.

We seek Your light, O God, in our midst this day, for each woman and man of this House, each entrusted to cooperate in the making of just laws which promote the flourishing of human freedom.

Let Your light break forth among these, our public servants. Give us faith that as each new day is bright with promise, so too is Your spirit's power to transform blame and bitterness into concord and unity, for the sake of the common good.

To You, therefore, generous Spirit of God, we commend our work this day, that we might walk freely in Your light, one people whose future is filled with hope.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POMPEO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

#### WELCOMING MOST REVEREND RICHARD PATES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce and recognize my friend Bishop Richard Pates of the Des Moines Diocese.

Born in St. Paul, Minnesota, and a huge Vikings fan, Bishop Pates attended Nazareth Hall Seminary and St. Paul Seminary in his hometown.

The bishop went on to graduate school at the North American College in Rome from the prestigious Gregorian University. In 1968, Bishop Pates was ordained at St. Peter's Basilica in Rome.

Bishop Pates' education laid the foundation for his impressive pastoral and administrative service to the church and, I am proud to say, led Bishop Pates to Iowa in 2008, when he was appointed by Pope Benedict XVI to be the ninth bishop for the Diocese of Des Moines. The bishop is also chair of the Iowa Catholic Conference, for which I thank him again for his service to the church and to Iowa.

I want to thank Bishop Pates for opening the House today with a prayer, thank him for his friendship, and ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Bishop Richard Pates to the people's House.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### MARCH FOR LIFE

(Mr. POMPEO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow hundreds of young people from across Kansas will join thousands of Americans, young and old, on The National Mall for the March for Life. They are here to remind us all that, in the midst of all the important issues we talk about here in Washington, D.C., every single life is a gift.

This year is the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade. Since then, over 55 million abortions have been performed in the United States. This stain upon our Nation has been allowed to continue for far too long. Yet in the face of this continuing tragedy, I am encouraged by the fact that today the pro-life movement is stronger than ever.

I see the evidence of that movement in the eyes of the young people, young people that will come to Washington tomorrow from Benedictine College, from Conway Springs High School, from Bishop Carroll High School, from Kapaun Mt. Carmel, and from both Kansas State University and Newman University. It will encourage me to continue my efforts to protect the unborn each and every day.

While some just talk the talk, tomorrow the young people from Kansas will walk the walk, and I look forward to joining with them on this very special and important day to protect this very important right.

#### AMERICA'S FAILING INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday a bridge collapsed in Cincinnati, Ohio, killing one person and injuring another. This tragedy calls to mind the collapse of the Schoharie Creek Bridge in New York in 1987, which killed 10 people, and the collapse of the I-35 West bridge in Minneapolis in 2007, which left 13 dead.

I don't know if more transportation funding would have prevented these collapses, but I do know that every second of every day seven cars drive on a bridge that is structurally deficient. There are 69,000 structurally deficient bridges in the Nation; there are over 99 structurally deficient bridges in western New York alone. These numbers are unacceptable. Congress is failing the American people by failing to address this issue.

Last night we heard from the President a plan to increase funding for infrastructure. That is a start, but I say we can and must do more. I encourage my colleagues to pass an infrastructure bill that is large enough to address the real needs of this Nation.

#### RECOGNIZING THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE SHOWMEN'S ASSOCIATION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the men and women of the Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association. These small business owners have been working together since 1967 to keep the outdoor amusement industry alive and strong through their combined efforts to remain one of the best forms of American family entertainment.

I am proud to have many of these individuals and families in the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, such as the Bartlebaughs, Carters, Garbricks, and Snyders.

Above and beyond providing good fun and family entertainment, members of the Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association have remained dedicated to



giving back by supporting both youth educational scholarships and FFA programs. Since 2005, the Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association has raised and donated over \$350,000 to youth educational scholarships and FFA programming through the work of more than 100 of their volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association put their individual goals aside for the common goals of the industry to serve the welfare of the community, the State, and the Nation. Their generous record reflects their success, and I thank them for their efforts.

#### WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS MUST BE RESPECTED

(Ms. FUDGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, this must be Groundhog Day because this House continues to revisit over and over again a woman's right to make decisions about her own health.

Roe v. Wade has long established a woman's constitutional right to have an abortion prior to a fetus' viability, yet Republicans continue to introduce legislation like H.R. 36 to ban abortions beginning at 20 weeks, with very limited exceptions.

In Congress and in several States, politicians are interfering in complicated private medical decisions that should be left to a woman, her family, and her doctor. That is why I am proud to reintroduce the Women's Health Protection Act, a bill making it unlawful for States to pass restrictive legislation that will endanger women's health and safety. Women's reproductive rights must be respected.

#### RECOGNIZING THE MARCH FOR LIFE

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 42-year anniversary since the Supreme Court decided Roe v. Wade. Since then, millions of innocent lives have been lost.

This is also a time to renew hope, as Americans continue to advocate for the respect of all human life. Tomorrow, upwards of a quarter of a million people from across the Nation and many from my district will march from The National Mall to the Supreme Court.

In Congress, we are working to help their efforts. I am cosponsoring H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation would limit abortion after the age at which evidence shows an unborn child can experience pain.

We must continue to stand for legislation that defends the right to life, without which all other rights are impossible.

#### REMEMBERING SISTER ANN KEEFE

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sister Ann Keefe, who passed away on Sunday, January 18.

In 1982, Sister Ann joined the ministry at Saint Michael's in Providence and began her lifelong fight for those who had no voice and those particularly vulnerable and marginalized. Recognizing the challenges that faced our city and our State, Sister Ann took action to help the poor, empower workers, advocate nonviolence, and promote justice for all.

Providing 30 years of service to our community, she cofounded the Institute for the Study and Practice of Nonviolence, which is credited with helping to sharply cut the city's murder rate. She started Providence City Arts to help at-risk youth through the arts, and she was involved in creating two dozen other organizations that continue to create opportunity for so many.

I had the extraordinary honor of working with Sister Ann over many years and treasured our friendship. She was a remarkable and strong woman who leaves behind a great legacy. Her passing is a tremendous loss for Rhode Island, but her presence will continue to be felt in the community through the organizations she helped found and run and the positive impact she has had on so many.

My thoughts and prayers are with her family and loved ones.

Rest in peace, Sister Ann.

#### FIXING THE VA IS DIFFICULT

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the President drove right past the Phoenix VA hospital, the facility at the center of the biggest scandal plaguing our Nation's veterans, without taking a second to stop.

Last night in his hour-long speech, the President hardly skimmed the surface in addressing the major challenges our veterans are facing, but he did mention we need to do more to provide our veterans more job opportunities.

We agree. In fact, on this same floor just a few weeks ago, Members of the House passed legislation that would do just that: encourage our employers to hire more of our heroes.

Astonishingly, though, our President failed to even mention one word about the excessive wait times, second-rate care, fraudulent records, destroyed files, and complete incompetence that had been brought to light last year in the VA.

He made no mention on the appeals process or recommendations to improve the lengthy process our veterans

face to access the care and treatment they deserve, a topic the House is scheduled to have a hearing on tomorrow.

Fixing the VA is difficult but not impossible. We are here to provide solutions, but we need our leader to be ready to work with us, to be ready to help us so we can finally give our veterans a system that works for them, not against them, in a timely fashion.

#### THE MIDDLE CLASS DESERVES A BREAK

(Mr. ISRAEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, the three most important topics in the President's State of the Union last night were, in order of importance: middle class, middle class, and middle class.

Now, some have called the President's desire to strengthen the middle class with a tax cut class warfare. Well, I have got to tell you, if you have been in the middle class, you feel like you have survived a war over the past many years.

There was the Great Recession, which was created by bad economic policies between 2000 and 2008. You lost your home values. You lost your 401(k). You watched your paychecks shrink.

Now you have gone through a recovery where the statistics tell you that things are going well: the economy has improved 12 percent; that is good news. Corporate profits are up 46 percent; that is good news. The stock market is up 92 percent; that is good news. But you look at your pay stub and say: Where is my good news? I am not keeping pace with everybody else.

In 1992, Jim Carville famously said, "It's the economy, stupid." In 2015, it is my paycheck, stupid. It is paramount that this Congress, Democrats and Republicans, find ways to provide tax cuts to provide the break that the great middle class deserves and the break that has eluded them for too long.

This is not class warfare, Mr. Speaker. This is growing the great and strong middle class of this country.

□ 1215

#### HONORING LEGACY OF BAYARD WINSLOW "CHIP" KENNETT II

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and legacy of Chip Kennett from Conway, New Hampshire, who passed away this weekend at the age of 34 after a heroic 2-year battle with lung cancer.

Chip was a dedicated public servant on Capitol Hill, devoted friend, father, husband, and inspiration to us all. Upon his diagnosis, Chip used his Capitol Hill experience to advocate on behalf of lung cancer research, testifying

before a Senate Aging Committee hearing in 2014 to increase the awareness of the disease. He worked to erase the stigma associated with lung cancer and, in doing so, left a legacy that will continue touching countless lives.

To those who mourn with us today, we rest easier knowing that we could not help but profit from his friendship, his optimism, and his sense of humor. He loved life completely and lived it for others. We are all immeasurably better for having known him.

My thoughts and prayers go out to his family and loved ones during this difficult time, especially his wife, Sheila; their two children, Joe Kennett and Crosby Reynolds; as well as his parents, Bayard and Theresa Kennett.

#### OPPOSING ATTACK ON WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE CHOICE

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today against H.R. 36, a bold attack on reproductive freedom. While in the North Carolina House, I fought tirelessly for women's reproductive choice. As the 100th woman in Congress, I will do the same in the U.S. House. The fight begins with speaking against this unconscionable bill.

Mr. FRANKS, women's health decisions are personal. They should be between a woman, her family, and her doctor—not the North Carolina House and not the U.S. House.

H.R. 36 would add barriers for women who often face complicated, heart-breaking circumstances. I join other women who adamantly oppose this bill, including many of my Republican colleagues.

Today, I stand with Senators, Representatives, and NARAL activists in delivering 150,000 American signatures opposing this bill. I respectfully urge my colleagues not to support this legislation.

A woman cannot call herself free who does not own or control her own body.

#### HAPPY BIRTHDAY WILLIAM TRAMMELL

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor an American hero, Mr. William Trammell, born January 28, 1920. A lifelong resident of Anderson County, he graduated from Clemson University in 1941 in the exceptional class of graduates known as the "wartime class," where 57 of his classmates lost their lives in World War II. They composed the backbone of what we understand today as the Greatest Generation.

Captain Trammell joined the 1st Engineer Amphibian Brigade during the war, and he was sent to Europe to fight

the Nazis. He participated in the North Africa invasion, as well as campaigns in Tunisia, southern Italy, and southern France. Fortunately, he returned home after 3½ years overseas suffering only minor injuries.

Once home, he pursued the American Dream. Mr. Trammell successfully operated three businesses, one of which is still in operation today and operated by his oldest son, Steve.

Mr. Trammell, along with his wife, Thelma, worked on the Eisenhower campaign. To this day, he represents the highest quality of individual that we expect as Americans. He has served his community and country with honor, dignity, and love. Today I would like to wish Mr. Trammell a happy 95th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage the House, as well as all Americans, to strive to live life as this exceptional man has and to dedicate their lives to something greater than themselves.

#### WORKING TOGETHER ON BEHALF OF AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last night President Obama called on Congress to work together on behalf of the American people. It is a call I hear from my constituents in Illinois every day. So as we begin the 114th Congress, I rise on their behalf to urge my colleagues to rise above partisanship, to strengthen our economy and put even more Americans back to work.

Today, all signs point to our economy being the strongest it has been in nearly a decade. Businesses are flourishing. We have gained nearly 3 million new jobs. But there are still 8.7 million Americans living in the shadow of the economic crisis who are struggling with chronic unemployment. They deserve a Congress that is focused and united in putting them back to work.

Let's work to reduce the tax burden on the middle class, putting more money in their pockets and making it easier for them to afford their homes and to send their kids to school so that the American Dream is within everyone's reach. Americans want a Congress that can overcome partisan gridlock to put the people first.

I urge my colleagues to put politics aside, to find a middle ground to help our middle class and put more Americans on the path to opportunity and prosperity.

#### YAKIMA COUNTY CELEBRATES 150TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, as the newly elected Congressman from central Washington, I rise to mark the

150th birthday of Yakima County, a county at the heart of my congressional district and the county where I was born and am proud to call my home. The Washington Territorial Legislature created Yakima County in 1865, nearly 25 years before Washington itself became a State.

I am a third-generation Yakima County farmer. My family and I continue to operate a 600-acre farm near the city of Sunnyside. Even before the creation of Yakima County, the agricultural industry recognized the vast environmental benefits of the region. Today, agriculture remains the lifeblood of Yakima County's economy, and I am pleased to represent those interests before the House Committee on Agriculture.

Today marks Yakima County's sesquicentennial. Happy 150th birthday. It is an honor to represent you in Congress.

#### FREE TRADE DEALS DISPROPORTIONATELY HURT COMMUNITIES OF COLOR

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, when jobs are shipped overseas because of bad trade deals, communities of color bear the huge brunt of the loss of those jobs. Of the 2.7 million jobs lost to China as a result of past trade deals, nearly 1 million of those jobs lost belong to people of color—one million jobs.

Even after they lost their jobs, bad trade deals continued to harm them. When they found another job, it was on average for a nearly 30 percent lower wage. Trade deals like the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is being negotiated in secret, wreak havoc on communities of color. We cannot allow more bad trade deals to be enacted, especially when unemployment rates and poverty rates in these communities are much too high already.

Congress must consider the consequences of these trade deals on communities of color and all workers in our country given the terrible impacts of past trade deals. We must demand transparency, ensure that environmental and labor standards and food safety standards are protected, and insist that Congress exercise its constitutional responsibility in ensuring fair and free trade. TPP is certainly not fair and must be defeated.

#### NO MORE ONE-SIZE-FITS-ALL FEDERAL DICTATES

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the American people spoke loud and clear in November, but it is evident from last night's State of the Union that President Obama wasn't listening. Despite a rejection of his policies at the ballot

box, the President continues to propose outdated, Washington-centered ideas that simply don't work.

The American people want Washington to stop interfering in their lives, and they don't need more one-size-fits-all Federal dictates. Republicans have a vision for the future, but President Obama appears to be mired in the past.

Last night, the President expressed a willingness to work with Republicans, and I hope that gesture is sincere. In the past, working together too often meant agreeing with whatever the President said. It is time for President Obama to live up to his rhetoric. House Republicans are eager to work together to increase opportunities for all Americans and empower people, not Washington.

#### A WOMAN'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO CHOOSE

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 36. This bill is a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling 42 years ago in *Roe v. Wade*. It is a dangerous attack on a woman's constitutional right to choose.

The bill does not include an exception for the physical or emotional health of a woman. It fails to provide sufficient protections for victims of rape and incest, and it has only a very narrow exception when a woman's life is in danger.

In short, the bill significantly reduces the safe, legal options that women have and prevents doctors from providing the most medically appropriate care for their patients.

Republicans have repeatedly demonstrated a disregard for women's health care, and this bill is just one more example of their continuing attack on women's rights. It is a step backward for women's health and, quite simply, a distraction from the important work that we should be undertaking. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO MEMORY OF CAROL I. GLOVER

(Mr. BEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an extraordinary woman and admired constituent, Carol Glover, who passed away on Monday, January 12, as a result of the tragic incident aboard Metro train 302.

Carol was a devoted mother who raised her two sons in Alexandria, Virginia. Many of her friends and family describe her as "the ultimate sports mom cheerleader" because she could often be found cheering on the sidelines of her sons' football, soccer, and bas-

ketball games. Carol was also the den mother for her sons' Cub Scouts troop and was said to treat all like her own children.

Carol had a successful 20-year career as a contractor for the Federal Government. She studied computer programming at Drexel University, where she graduated with honors, and she recently received the Employee of the Year honor. It is clear she was as diligent in her work as she was in raising her children.

Carol will be remembered as a woman of strong faith with a gentle demeanor and warm heart. At her funeral her mother said: "In life we all have a dark tunnel to go through. Stay on track, and you will see the light at the end of the tunnel." Her mother believed that Carol had found that light.

Carol leaves behind sons Anthony, who served in the Marines for 13 years, and Marcus, who works for a Christian nonprofit here in Washington, D.C.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to Carol's family, friends, and to all those whose lives were touched by this amazing woman.

#### WORKING TOGETHER

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to attend the State of the Union Address last night for the first time, representing the Sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

After listening to the President's speech, I hope that he will find common ground and work with Congress on a number of complex issues facing our Nation, including enacting job-creating policies for hardworking families, fixing our broken health care system, and reining in our out-of-control debt, and that is just to name a few.

But unfortunately, there were a number of veto threats and proposals which amount to more government overreach into the lives of hardworking taxpayers.

Americans are looking for Congress and the President to work together, not for the President to take a go-it-alone approach and repeatedly threaten use of veto power. We are not looking to grow our Federal government any further.

That said, I agree specifically with the President's desire for improving cybersecurity legislation and creating more economic opportunity for our Nation's veterans. I disagree with his approach on other matters discussed, specifically, certain tax reform measures that will ultimately amount to a trickle-down tax increase on middle class Americans.

I am confident we can find some common ground and adequately fund our Nation's transportation and infrastructure needs, and I look forward to doing that.

#### ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 39

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Nunnelee to rank immediately after Mr. Womack.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Garrett; Mr. Diaz-Balart; Mr. Cole; Mr. McClintock; Mrs. Black; Mr. Rokita; Mr. Woodall; Mrs. Blackburn; Mrs. Hartzler; Mr. Rice of South Carolina; Mr. Stutzman; Mr. Sanford; Mr. Schock; Mr. Womack; Mr. Brat; Mr. Blum; Mr. Mooney of West Virginia; Mr. Grothman; Mr. Palmer; Mr. Moolenaar; and Mr. Westerman.

Ms. FOXX (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 161, NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 36, PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 38 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 38

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 161) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage

without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1230

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 38 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

The rule before us today, Mr. Speaker, provides for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. It is truly fitting that the House considers this legislation in the shadow of the 42nd anniversary of the *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* decisions that gave Americans abortion on demand at any stage of pregnancy.

This legislation is a commonsense step in recognizing the truth that science has made more clear with the passage of time: the unborn child in the womb is alive and a functioning member of the human family.

Science has shown us that the most fundamental precursors to an unborn child feeling pain are already in place by 8 weeks in development. Necessary connections between the brain and spinal cord are in place and complete by 18 weeks.

The House Judiciary Committee heard testimony by expert physicians that the earlier premature babies are delivered, the more acutely they feel pain. It is clear that unborn children at 20 weeks of development are capable of feeling pain and deserving of protection.

In spite of the 60 percent of Americans who believe we should limit abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will continue to protest this sensible legislation, seeking to keep us in the company of only seven other nations that allow elective abortion after 20 weeks, which includes such well-known human rights leaders as North Korea, China, and Vietnam.

This vital, lifesaving legislation is not the only important legislation the House will consider this week. This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

The Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act recognizes the positive impact America's shale revolution has had on energy prices and the potential it holds to lower them further. We are in the midst of another hard winter, and red tape reduction is necessary to ensure we have the infrastructure needed to ensure low-cost natural gas is able to reach our coldest States when they need it most without price shocks or shortages.

H.R. 161 introduces critical reform to ensure prompt consideration of necessary permitting requests for construction or updates to natural gas pipelines, providing certainty to energy companies and the consumers they serve.

The legislation would require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to approve or deny a requested pipeline certificate no later than 12 months after receiving a complete application that is ready to be processed and has engaged in the prefiling process.

H.R. 161 also ensures that relevant agencies provide approval or denial within 90 days of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission completing its final environmental document.

Finally, the legislation would put permits into effect, notwithstanding agencies' failures to provide approval within the time mandated, with allowances for the addition of conditions consistent with the final environmental document.

H.R. 161 is the reintroduction of H.R. 1900, which passed this House on a bipartisan basis in the 113th Congress. H.R. 1900 received extensive committee consideration, including numerous hearings on the underlying issues, prompting the legislation, as well as the subcommittee hearing and subcommittee and full committee mark-ups on the bill.

Both H.R. 36 and H.R. 161 are truly important legislation that Americans would be well-served to have considered this week, and I commend both my bills to my colleagues as deserving of their support.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, while I have great respect for the gentlewoman from North Carolina, I don't have a lot of respect for this process. I would like to begin today by saying a word or two about the process being used by the Republicans here on the floor—actually, three words: "It stinks. Again."

We are all very happy—delighted even—to hear our Republican friends

say that they wanted to make this Congress into a place where we could work together, but actions speak louder than words, and here are some of their actions: five closed rules.

Until yesterday, 100 percent of our Rules Committee meetings have been called so-called emergency meetings, and 100 percent of the bills the committee has sent to the floor have drawn a veto threat, and once again, the Republicans are using one rule for multiple bills. This is a disturbing pattern that is quickly becoming a bad habit.

The Republican leadership apparently isn't content to exclude Democrats from offering substantive, germane, and thoughtful amendments. They are also shutting down the debate itself.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is only a few weeks old. We have 23 months left to go. Are the Republicans really saying that we can't find an extra hour for debate during the next 23 months? Of course we can. They just prefer not to. It is unfair, it is undemocratic, it is unnecessary, and it needs to stop.

Now, as to the bill that is before us today, last night, as we all know, President Obama laid out a bold, clear, and exciting agenda to spur economic growth and ensure that prosperity is shared by all Americans, not just the wealthy few and special interests. I thought it was a terrific speech.

Apparently, my Republican friends weren't paying very close attention. I know they were there in this Chamber because I saw many of them. The Speaker himself was sitting right behind the President. Maybe they were sending each other cat videos or taking selfies because the President made it very clear that if Congress sends him bills that move us backward, he will veto them, and both of these bills deserve his veto.

The first, H.R. 161, is a solution in search of a problem. It is as simple as that. The bill would automatically approve natural gas pipeline projects if FERC or other Federal agencies do not act on required permits or certificates within a rigid, unworkable timeframe.

A GAO report concluded that FERC's pipeline permitting process is predictable and consistent, with 91 percent of pipeline applications receiving a decision within 12 months. During committee testimony last Congress, even industry representatives agreed that the current permitting process is "generally very good." It is not every day that regulators and industry agree that the current system works.

So why would we move forward on a bill that disrupts a system that works is beyond me. In fact, this bill makes it more likely that FERC will deny more projects just to comply with the severe timeline.

In Massachusetts, we are dealing with the proposed Tennessee Gas pipeline which would run through parts of my district and would cut through a number of environmentally sensitive

lands, including Northfield State Forest and the Montague aquifer and management area.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment with my good friend Congresswoman NIKI TSONGAS, whose district would also be affected by the proposed pipeline, to keep the existing review process in place for proposed pipelines that cross Federal, State, or local conservation or recreation lands because, if we have already invested Federal and State money into identifying these lands as environmentally sensitive, it doesn't make any sense to expedite the approval of a pipeline that could bulldoze right through them.

It is worth a debate. Unfortunately, Republicans on the Rules Committee voted down this commonsense amendment in a party-line vote.

As the gentlewoman from North Carolina pointed out, both of these rules are completely closed. Even though they did not go through regular order, even though there were no hearings in this Congress or no markup, nobody—no Democrat, no Republican—can offer an amendment.

Then there is H.R. 36. This is just the latest Republican assault on women's reproductive rights. It is their latest attempt to put politicians in the middle of the private medical decisions of women. It is blatantly unconstitutional, and it fails to take into consideration the fact that some pregnancies can have catastrophic, heartbreaking complications, even after 20 weeks.

To make matters worse, this legislation lacks a reasonable exception for victims of rape and incest by requiring victims to report cases of rape and incest to law enforcement in order to have access to an abortion, this despite the fact that research shows that the majority of sexual assaults are unreported, and on top of that, the exception on incest is only for minors.

Mr. Speaker, what really bothers me about bills like this is that the same people who vote for them routinely vote to cut the WIC program, to cut Head Start and childcare programs and SNAP and school lunch programs, and elementary and secondary education funding. This hypocrisy is breathtaking.

Mr. Speaker, leading medical groups agree that doctors, in consultation with women and their families, should make medical decisions, not the politicians.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. They deserve a better process, and they deserve better legislation. We certainly have a lot to do to help get this country to continue on the road to prosperity, to make sure that everybody can share in this economy's growth.

I urge my colleagues: let's focus on those issues, let's come together and do something for the American people, and enough of these message bills.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I need to remind this House that during the Democrats' time in the majority, there were two rules packages providing consideration of seven unrelated measures.

In the 110th Congress, their first year in the majority, the rules package provided for consideration of five measures.

In the 111th Congress, the Democrat majority provided for the consideration of two separate measures in the rules package.

The Democrat majority went directly to the floor with these bills, with no committee consideration and without even allowing the Rules Committee to debate these measures or report an appropriate rule for consideration.

In the 110th Congress, Ranking Member SLAUGHTER and Democrats on the Rules Committee reported three additional closed rules, starting the Congress out with eight closed rules in the opening weeks.

In the 111th Congress, Democrats reported out two additional closed rules, for a total of four closed rules in the opening weeks of that Congress.

Unlike our Democrat colleagues, the Speaker and Chairman SESSIONS had provided the opportunity to have hearings before the Rules Committee.

It is our goal to return to regular order now that our committees are organizing, but the false attacks by my colleagues do not stand up to the light of day when you compare our records.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), one of the preeminent defenders of life in this Congress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend for yielding and thank her for her strong leadership for human rights and for the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, pain—we all dread it, we avoid it, we even fear it, and we all go to extraordinary lengths to mitigate its severity and its duration; yet an entire age group of human beings are, today, subjected to a deadly, extraordinarily painful procedure, one of which is called the dismemberment method, the D&E.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a modest but necessary attempt to at least protect babies who are 20 weeks old and pain capable from having to suffer and die from abortion. Children, including children with disabilities, Mr. Speaker, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

One leading expert in the field of fetal pain, Dr. Anand, at the University of Tennessee, stated in his expert report, commissioned by the U.S. Department of Justice:

The human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks of gestation, if not earlier, and the pain perceived by a fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns or older children.

□ 1245

Dr. Colleen Malloy, assistant professor, Division of Neonatology at Northwestern University, in her testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, said:

When we speak of infants at 20 weeks postfertilization, we no longer have to rely on inferences or ultrasound technology, because such premature patients are kicking, moving, reacting, and developing right before our eyes in the neonatal intensive care unit.

In other words, there are children the same age who, in utero, can be killed by abortion—and painfully—or who have been born and who are now being given lifesaving assistance. She went on to say:

In today's medical arena, we resuscitate patients at this age and are able to witness their ex-utero growth.

Dr. Malloy concludes:

I could never imagine subjecting my tiny patients to horrific procedures such as those that involve limb detachment or cardiac injection.

Again, that is what the abortionists do.

Surgeons today, Mr. Speaker, are entering the womb to perform life-enhancing and lifesaving corrective surgeries on unborn children. They have seen those babies flinch, jerk around, move around, and recoil from sharp objects and incisions. As they seek to heal, surgeons are today routinely administering anesthesia to unborn children in the womb—a best medical practice—to protect them from pain. We now know that the child ought to be treated as a patient and that there are many anomalies, sicknesses, and disabilities that could be treated with a degree of success while the child is still in utero. The child ought to be seen as a patient. When those interventions are performed, again, anesthesia is given.

Last June, TIME Magazine's cover story, "Saving Preemies," explored the premie revolution and how cutting-edge medicine and dedicated caregivers are helping the tiniest babies to survive and thrive. TIME says:

Thanks to advances that had not been made even a few years ago, the odds of surviving and thriving are improving all the time.

Abortionists, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, are in the business of ensuring that children neither survive nor thrive. Children, including children with disabilities, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, I yield myself such time as I may consume as I want to respond to this issue about process.

When Speaker BOEHNER became the Speaker of this House, in his opening speech, one of the things he said was:

You will always have the right to a robust debate and an open process that allows you to represent your constituents—to make your case, to offer alternatives, and to be heard.

Clearly, we have not been granted that in any way, shape, or form.

While the gentlewoman may point to the sins of the past of Democratic majorities, nothing compares to what the Republicans did in the last Congress. The Republicans presided over the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America.

I mean, you made history, and that is not something to be proud of.

When my friends talk about openness and transparency and about the desire to allow this to be a deliberative place where people of varying viewpoints can have a forum to debate, it is not reflective of reality. We are beginning this Congress just as my colleagues conducted the last Congress—in the most closed way possible. I regret that very much, especially on bills that have not even been through the committee hearing process in this Congress or that have not been marked up.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I want to thank my colleague for his great work and for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, today, The Wall Street Journal polled the American public and found that these are their top three priorities: creating jobs, defeating ISIS, and reducing the Federal budget deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I insert that piece from The Wall Street Journal into the RECORD.

[From The Wall Street Journal]

POLL FINDS AGENDA GAP BETWEEN LEADERS,  
AMERICAN PEOPLE

(By Janet Hook)

Republicans are trying to burnish their party's image—and Congress—by promising to “get things done” now that the GOP controls both the House and Senate. But a new Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll shows that the public doesn't care much about some of the first things the GOP, or President Barack Obama, is trying to do.

The poll conducted from Jan. 14-17 found that two of the major issues congressional Republicans and the White House have identified as candidates for bipartisan action—trade and simplification of the tax code—didn't even make the top five issues that people feel need to be addressed urgently.

The poll tried to identify the issues that are most important to Americans by asking which issues they considered an “absolute priority” for Congress and the president to act on this year, as opposed to issues that they think could be delayed.

The list was topped by enduring concerns: job creation, fighting Islamic militants in Iraq and Syria, reducing the federal deficit and securing the U.S. border.

But people are virtually yawning at the prospect of expanding U.S. trade, a priority for an administration trying to finalize a new free-trade agreement with Asian and Pacific Rim countries. Only 20% said that was an urgent priority for this year, 59% said it could be delayed until next year and 16% said it shouldn't be pursued at all.

“It's a reminder that this is for the most part a very distant economic issue and it's not one that people focus on,” said Bill McInturff, a Republican pollster who conducted the poll with Democrat Fred Yang.

The apathy about trade is bipartisan. Only 22% of Republicans and 21% of Democrats said it was a top priority.

Simplifying the tax code is also an issue that's not a top-five policy priority for most Americans, but is treated like a motherhood issue by politicians of both parties. Just over half polled said it was an urgent priority—less than the percentage who wanted to make “efforts to address Iran's nuclear program” a top agenda item.

Even some of the issues Washington lawmakers are fighting over are matters of only marginal concern to many people. Republicans have acted quickly on a bill to finish construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, and Mr. Obama threw down his first veto threat over it. But nearly four in ten people polled said they didn't know enough about the issue to have an opinion.

The survey of policy priorities underscored another trend that doesn't bode well for bipartisan cooperation: On all but a handful of issues, such as job creation and infrastructure repair, the poll found big disparities in the interests of the two parties. So, while 67% of Democrats identified income inequality as an urgent priority, only 19% of Republicans did. U.S. border security was a top priority for 79% of Republicans but only 43% of Democrats.

It's not surprising, then, that the poll found people were down on the idea of having divided government. Mr. Obama and Republicans in Congress may agree on the need to “get things done.” The problem is there isn't a lot of agreement on what “things” should get priority.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, why am I bringing that up? The offense, to me, is that there are so many people in Congress who always want to bring up this issue of eating away at Roe v. Wade. They don't have the nerve, I think, really, to try to take that away.

Roe v. Wade gave women a choice, and I believe that, if you don't want to have that choice yourself, don't use it; but what right do people who do not agree with choice have to make it the law of the land—to require everybody to live under what they believe is true?

Now, there is not a scintilla of scientific evidence that at 20 weeks pain is felt. The neural connections are not there to have that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to insert into the RECORD what scientists—the executive vice president and others—have said from the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists in that this is not possible.

JANUARY 21, 2015.

DEAR MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, We, the undersigned medical and public health organizations, stand in strong opposition to H.R. 36, the so-called “Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act,” sponsored by Representative Trent Franks (R-AZ) and Representative Marsha Blackburn (R-TN). Politicians are not doctors and should not interfere in personal, medical decisions.

If enacted, H.R. 36 would ban most abortions in the United States at 20 weeks after fertilization, clearly before viability. The bill threatens providers with fines and/or imprisonment for providing professional and compassionate care, and is intended to intimidate and discourage doctors from providing abortion care. This bill places health care providers in an untenable situation—when they are facing a complex, urgent medical situation, they must think about an un-

just law instead of about how to protect the health and safety of their patients.

Politicians are not medical experts. H.R. 36 disregards the health issues and real life situations that women can face in pregnancy. Every woman faces her own unique circumstances, challenges, and potential complications. She needs to be able to make decisions based on her physician's medical advice and what is right for her and her family.

H.R. 36 would force a doctor to deny an abortion to a woman who has determined that terminating a pregnancy is the right decision for her, including women carrying a pregnancy with severe and lethal anomalies that may not be diagnosed until after 20 weeks in pregnancy and women with serious medical conditions brought on or exacerbated by pregnancy. H.R. 36 contains no exception to preserve the health of the woman. Instead, it includes a vague life endangerment exception which exposes doctors to the threat of criminal prosecution, limiting their options for care that is often needed in complex, urgent medical situations.

Moreover, H.R. 36 would dictate how physicians should care for their patients based on inaccurate and unscientific claims. Conclusive research shows that contrary to the sponsors' claims, the fetus doesn't have the neurological structures needed to experience pain until significantly later in pregnancy.

We strongly oppose governmental interference in the patient-provider relationship and criminalizing provision of care to women and their families. H.R. 36 jeopardizes the health of women in the U.S. by limiting access to safe and legal abortion and replaces personal decision-making by women and their doctors with political ideology. Our organizations urge you to oppose passage of H.R. 36.

Sincerely,

American College of Nurse-Midwives,  
American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists,  
American Medical Students Association,  
American Medical Women's Association,  
American Nurses Association,  
American Society for Reproductive Medicine,  
Association of Reproductive Health Professionals,  
Medical Students for Choice,  
National Abortion Federation,  
National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health,  
National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association,  
Physicians for Reproductive Health,  
Planned Parenthood Federation of America,  
Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine,  
Society of Family Planning.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, as a scientist, I have learned that this Congress does not take scientific facts as facts but that it views them as, maybe, suggestions. Yet how often it is that we are playing with people's lives. It is the most personal decision one could ever make, and it should be made between the woman, her family, or whomever she wants to consult—her doctor, her priest, her pastor—anybody—but not the Congress of the United States.

Why do men in blue suits and red ties get to make that decision when it has nothing to do with scientific or medical facts? It is absolutely astonishing to me that this continues over and over again; and in the States that have passed 20-week abortion bills, the bills have always been overturned with regard to the constitutional question, and this will be as well.



Time and time again, when asked about it, neurobiology specialists, obstetricians, and gynecologists the world over have refuted the scientific and factual premises of this bill, but nobody cares about that here. I saw a great button that called the people here who are trying to do this today “gyneticians.” A “gynetician” is described as a politician who knows more about women’s health than doctors do.

We can go on with this, but what we need to remember is that, last night, half of the President’s speech dealt with people who are underpaid and who struggle to live in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me get right to the chase here.

Barney Frank, our former colleague, said that many people believe that life begins at conception and ends at birth.

I want to know how this Congress is going to comply with what the President asked us last night: Will you give more money for child care? for daycare? Will you give more money for early education? Will you make sure that mothers are paid as much as the men they are working with and that the same jobs pay the same? Will you do something about paid sick leave? Will you help these children get to college?

Absolutely not. The record has been clear on all of these issues.

There is something really awful when we take up the time to please the base of some sort out there against all scientific belief and everything that we know about medicine. I wish this Congress would stop the folly. We are faced with a lot of serious problems in this country. Again, as my colleague points out, we have no ability to amend it. Nobody else can be heard on anything else. It is simply going to be voted on; the Senate may or may not ever take it up; and the President will not sign it. It is the same thing that we did over and over in the last session—kill health care.

Do everything you can. Nothing is going to be signed. No bills will be made. It is a shame. I have labeled it before as “legislative malpractice,” and that is exactly what is going on with this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again, we find ourselves in a position in which we must correct the record.

Over the last 4 years, Republicans have implemented reforms to make the U.S. House of Representatives more open and transparent than ever. Under this GOP majority, Members on both sides of the aisle have been allowed to offer significantly more amendments—and the House has operated under far more open rules—than were allowed under the previous Democrat-controlled House.

The GOP majority allowed nearly 1,500 amendments to be considered on

the House floor in the 113th Congress. Under Speaker PELOSI, the House did not consider a single bill under an open rule throughout the 111th Congress. That is the definition of a closed process, Mr. Speaker, and it is precisely what Speaker BOEHNER successfully changed to start the 112th Congress and to continue throughout the 113th Congress. Under the current GOP majority, the House has considered 38 open or modified open rules.

When you compare the record of the Republican majority and the most recent Democrat majority, any fair analysis will show that Republicans are running a more open, transparent House of Representatives that allows for greater participation by all Members.

The problem throughout the last Congress resided in the Senate and its failure to act on almost everything passed by the House. When the Senate did decide to act, then-majority leader, Democrat HARRY REID, virtually locked down the amendment process on the Senate floor. When you compare the nearly 1,500 amendments considered on the House floor with the Senate’s record of inaction, a more accurate picture emerges.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and, most importantly, of the underlying bill, H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act. I encourage all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to support this important job creation bill.

The great State of Maine is home to the most skilled papermakers in the world. Even so, last year, mills in Bucksport, Old Town, and Millinocket closed, laying off 1,000 of our workers. Soon, a fourth mill, which is in Madison, will temporarily shut down, furloughing another 215 workers.

For each mill, the high cost of electricity to run its machinery was a primary reason for closure. Almost half the power plants in New England burn natural gas to generate electricity. We must allow the increased production and transportation of natural gas to drive down the cost of electric power and save our mills, our factories, and save our jobs.

Today, I am proud to cosponsor this new legislation in order to expedite the permitting to construct more and larger capacity natural gas pipelines throughout America. I ask my Republican and Democrat colleagues to band together in supporting this critically important jobs bill. It is the fair and the right thing to do.

Hardworking American taxpayers deserve a more effective government that works together to solve our serious problems. We have the responsibility and the authority to help our families live better lives, with fatter paychecks and more financial security. Let’s get this done.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say for the record that facts are facts are facts. There is no denying that the last Republican Congress held the record for the most closed rules in the history of the United States.

Maybe I am misunderstanding the current rule, but to the best of my knowledge, not a single amendment is allowed, notwithstanding that in this Congress there have been no hearings and no markups.

Is it appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for me to ask unanimous consent to amend H.R. 36 and make it an open rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina would have to yield for such a request to be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina yield?

Ms. FOXX. I will not yield.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So there it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I want to thank the ranking member for yielding, for his leadership, and for really making it clear exactly what we are dealing with today and why many of us strongly oppose this rule and this bill.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the anniversary of Roe v. Wade. Over 40 years ago, the Supreme Court ruled that a woman could make her own personal health care decisions without interference from politicians. Yet here we are again, in 2015, debating this constitutionally protected right.

H.R. 36 would ban all abortions at 20 weeks, with extremely limited exceptions. A ban on an abortion after 20 weeks makes it harder for women who are already facing difficult circumstances. This is so bad. This is so wrong.

□ 1300

Every woman has a right to a safe medical procedure. And this decision, while difficult, is hers to make, not yours and not mine. This is her decision.

This bill is part of a broader effort to chip away at abortion access, a right that has already been decided by the Supreme Court and is the law of the land. Yet Republicans once again are focused on dictating what women can do with their bodies, denying their rights and endangering their health.

Mr. Speaker, this radical GOP bill undermines women’s constitutional rights under Roe v. Wade. This is a dangerous assault on women’s health freedoms. Women should not have to justify their personal medical decisions.

Abortions later in a pregnancy can involve rare, severe fetal abnormalities or pose serious risks to the health of women, but these procedures may be medically necessary to save the woman’s life.

This is an agonizing decision that a woman should make with her doctor,

her family, or whomever, but not her congressional Representatives. We have seen what happens when politicians interfere in these deeply personal medical decisions and tie doctors' hands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. Let me just say that the AMA has stated very clearly that this bill compromises a doctor's ability to provide medical treatment in the best interest of the patient.

Members of Congress have no right to interfere in health care decisions of women. This is a private matter. And the last time I looked, I thought we do have a right to privacy in this country.

So we have got to continue to fight against these attacks on women's health, on our constitutional rights, and on the right to privacy. I hope you vote "no" on this rule and "no" on this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Massachusetts knows very well that the number of closed rules last Congress was a procedural effect of Republicans' efforts to reopen the government. America tires of this debate. Let's return to real issues with an impact on Americans' lives.

Mr. Speaker, we go to extraordinary lengths in this country to save the lives of born human beings because we value life so much. However, there are many who do not hold the unborn in the same esteem, and that is tragic for the more than 1 million unborn babies who lose their lives every year. There is nothing more important than protecting voiceless unborn children and their families from the travesty of abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, over these next 2 days, you will hear many of my colleagues rise in support of H.R. 36, as well they should. This bill protects pain-capable, pre-born children from being subjected to violent, dismembering abortions, also known as D&E abortions.

One former abortionist, Dr. Anthony Levatino, testified in May 2013 before the House Judiciary Committee and described the procedure by saying:

A second-trimester D&E abortion is a blind procedure. Picture yourself reaching in with a Sopher clamp and grasping anything you can. Once you have grasped something inside, squeeze on the clamp to set the jaws and pull hard—really hard.

This is from a former abortionist describing the procedure:

You feel something let go and out pops a fully formed leg about 6 inches long. Reach in again and again with that clamp and tear out the spine, intestines, heart, and lungs.

How disgusting. How repugnant. How wrong. Any nation, any party, any person that claims to respect human rights and accepts basic science must reject this pain-filled act of barbarism.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and, most important, in supporting H.R. 36.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill. This bill is just as unconstitutional as it was when it was introduced in the last Congress. It poses just as serious a risk to the health and civil liberties of American women. And this time around, it comes with an additional slap in the face to women because, if this rule passes, the bill will come to a vote on the 42nd anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*.

By attempting to outlaw almost all abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, this bill would clearly violate the constitutional principles the Court laid down in that decision a generation ago. Women must be allowed to decide their health care decisions. They need to do it in consultation with their doctors, with their families, and with their clergy and not have those decisions made for them by Washington politicians.

The Republican majority always claims to be against government overreach and for science. Well, they should take a look at the legislation they bring to the floor. This bill would extend the Federal Government's reach all the way into the doctor's office. And it denies medical science. It threatens providers with jail for performing a procedure that is constitutionally protected and often medically necessary. It places obstacles in the way of rape victims who seek help. It would put thousands of women at risk.

In short, this is another Republican ideological assault on women. We should reject it wholeheartedly. Our priority should be to help American workers with jobs, with increased wages—including women—and not turning the clock back to the 1950s with this kind of unconstitutional posturing.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and the underlying bill and truly vote for women in the United States today.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to respond to the charge that this legislation is unconstitutional. In 2007, the Supreme Court upheld the Federal Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act as an appropriate use of Congress' powers under the Commerce Clause. This legislation follows that act's model by asserting Congress' authority to extend protection to pain-capable unborn children under the Commerce, Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the 14th Amendment.

It is sad that opponents of this legislation are attempting to use the Constitution as a roadblock to prevent life-saving legislation, but the Supreme Court's position is clear.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, a great shadow looms over America, the home of the brave.

More than 18,000 very late-term abortions are occurring in America every year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their pain-capable babies to torture and death without anesthesia. It is the greatest human rights atrocity in the United States today.

Almost every other major civilized nation on Earth protects pain-capable babies at this age, and every credible poll of the American people shows that they are overwhelmingly in favor of protecting them. And yet we have given these little babies less legal protection from unnecessary painful cruelty than the protection we have given farm animals under the Federal Humane Slaughter Act.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you that today the winds of change have begun to blow and the tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America because today we take up the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber.

It is not perfect, Mr. Speaker. Each one of us would have written it a little differently if we could have done so. However, no matter how it is shouted down or what distortions, deceptive what-ifs, distractions, diversions, gotchas, twisting of words, changing the subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, it is a deeply sincere effort, beginning at the sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and their pain-capable babies from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand, and, ultimately, it is one all humane Americans can support if they truly understand it for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing to these babies is real—and we all know it—and it is time to change and protect them.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), a champion for women's rights.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Instead of prioritizing the needs of women and families, we are once again discussing a bill that attacks women's rights.

When I ask women in my district what they need, they talk about not being able to find quality, affordable child care. But here in Congress we are talking about a bill that tells women they don't have a right to plan their own family.

Women in my district talk about making sure they receive equal pay for equal work. What are we talking about? A bill that tells women that politicians are better able to make their health decisions than they are.

Women in my district talk about making sure victims and survivors of domestic violence have the resources they need to build a better life. But we are talking about a bill that tells women that if they become pregnant because they were raped, they better have a police report to prove it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. American women pay taxes, raise their families, contribute to our economy, and are over half of the electorate. Yet rather than helping these women succeed and grow our economy, we give them this bill that forces backward ideological beliefs into women's private medical decisions.

I urge my colleagues to get back to work for women and families of this country and reject this dangerous bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is disappointing to hear my colleagues criticize this legislation in this way. We consider many weighty issues in this body with great implications for our future, but few of those issues command our attention as much as those that impact children, as this legislation does. This is right and appropriate.

I fear for both our future and our present if we continue to tolerate the death of innocent children in the womb. Every life matters. It is my hope that a culture of life will take hold and all children will be protected in law in the near future, but today we have an opportunity to come together and find consensus that nearly fully developed, viable children should be protected, particularly as individuals capable of experiencing great pain.

The necessity of that protection is made even clearer when considering the type of abortion these growing children are subjected to.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that the American people understand exactly what happens when they hear the word "abortion." According to Planned Parenthood, the largest abortion provider in America, babies aborted at 14 weeks or later are often subjected to dismemberment abortions, which are incredibly gruesome and painful.

What follows is heart-wrenching to describe, Mr. Speaker, but we must face the truth of what we are currently permitting. As if in a horror movie, the abortionist begins by suctioning out the amniotic fluid, then rips the limbs from the infant's body with a steel tool and finishes by crushing the skull of the infant he has dismembered.

Take a moment to consider that. This is the most common abortion per-

formed in the second trimester, not a rare tragedy.

As a Nation, we rightfully give the safety of our children the highest importance. In spite of that, we continue to allow these horrific procedures that an overwhelming majority of nations in the world have sworn off. As I mentioned before, only seven nations allow elective abortions after 20 weeks' gestation.

□ 1315

How can America continue to be one of them? We must leave this practice behind.

That is why I am a cosponsor of the underlying legislation to prohibit elective abortions in the United States past 20 weeks. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a commonsense reform to our American principles of protecting life as the most fundamental constitutional right.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. After all the talk by our Republican friends about focusing their efforts on jobs and growing the economy, so far their rhetoric does not match their record.

Last week, we took up a pipeline bill that, according to the State Department, would only create 34 jobs, and the bill that we have on the pipeline today probably won't create one single job, but what it will do, it will make it easier to damage the environment.

The majority has also introduced six antichoice bills in the past 7 days, and what all these bills have in common is that they will not create one single American job.

Instead of a jobs agenda, the majority seems bound and determined to attack women's rights, to take away a woman's constitutional right to make for herself the most private and personal and intimate decisions.

Now, we are taking up this bill, H.R. 36, which is based on the insulting belief that women are incapable and unprepared to make decisions about their own bodies and their own health care.

Forty-two years ago this week, the Supreme Court, in *Roe v. Wade*, made it clear that a woman has a constitutional right to decide for herself these private issues concerning her own health and well-being.

This is not only insulting to the women of this country, it is just another pointless exercise in political posturing. It will never become law. It is a waste of Congress' time. What we should be doing instead is focusing on any idea or measure that can help create greater economic opportunity for all Americans.

The President pointed out last night that our economy is on the rise. Under

his leadership, we are experiencing the strongest private sector job growth we have had in 17 years, over 11 million new jobs.

Let's not squander this opportunity. Let's work together to create real jobs, not political posturing for the American people.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Thankfully, the American people recognize that we are speaking about protecting vulnerable lives here. A March 2013 poll conducted by The Polling Company found that 64 percent of the public supports a law like the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act prohibiting an abortion after 20 weeks, when an unborn baby can feel pain, unless the life of the mother is in danger.

Supporters include 47 percent of those who identified themselves as "pro-choice" in the poll. The poll also found that 63 percent of women believe that abortion should not be permitted after the point where substantial medical evidence says that the unborn child can feel pain. That finding was not an unusual outlier. It is representative of the true beliefs of the American people.

According to a 2013 Gallup Poll, 64 percent of Americans support prohibiting second trimester abortions, and 80 percent support prohibiting third trimester abortions. Even The Huffington Post found in 2013 that 59 percent of Americans support limiting abortions after 20 weeks.

Let no one believe that our concern is only for the child. A study in the *Obstetrics and Gynecology* journal found that a woman seeking an abortion after 20 weeks' gestation is 35 times more likely to die from an abortion than she would have been from an abortion in the first trimester. At 21 weeks or more, she is 91 times more likely to die. Abortion is a danger to both lives, the mother and the child.

Mr. Speaker, Congress cannot sit idly by while this grotesque and brutal procedure, which rips the tiny baby apart, limb from limb in the womb, and threatens the life of the mother, is performed in our country. This is why it is necessary for Congress to pass H.R. 36 and protect the lives of these unborn children from excruciating pain.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), somebody who believes in protecting women's rights.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. McGovern.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that pain is a subterfuge. This bill is not about pain to the fetus. This bill is about outlawing abortion and repealing *Roe v. Wade*.

The other side knows that the Supreme Court has set out in *Roe v. Wade* the conditions of viability, and viability is 22–24 weeks. Well, they couldn't get past that in the Court, they knew

they couldn't, so they created this new class of when the baby, the child, can feel pain.

They found a doctor that said he assumes they can feel pain, and they base their whole premise on that, an argument to try to repeal Roe v. Wade and to not give the women of this country the opportunity to exercise choice on their own lives and when they produce children.

This has been the law in this country since 1973. I consider it the right law. I was in law school when the Supreme Court brought down Roe v. Wade. It was progress, and we continue to march forward, but the other side wants to stop progress. If they could outlaw all abortions, they would do it, and this is the first step toward doing it.

They don't provide for the life of the mother in the bill. They don't provide for exceptions for rape and incest, and they didn't allow any amendments because they knew if they had amendments they would carry, and the full rape and incest exceptions which are in the law today would be put on this bill, and that would be difficult for them to swallow.

This is a sham on pain. This is an attempt to take women's rights away and to repeal Roe v. Wade. I would ask that when the bill comes up that we vote "no" and vote women first and progress.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time at this time until the gentleman from Massachusetts is ready to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Sadly, we have seen all too well how money has polluted our politics and is undermining our democracy, so I am going to urge people to vote against the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of a sensible constitutional amendment, H.J. Res. 22, a measure that I have sponsored with my friends, TED DEUTCH of Florida, DONNA EDWARDS of Maryland, and JOHN SARBANES of Maryland, to overturn these decisions and make clear that Congress and States have the authority to regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money to influence elections.

To discuss this proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts, a leader in the fight to get money out of politics.

Last night, in his State of the Union Address, President Obama called on Republicans and Democrats in Congress to embrace a better politics where we spend less time fundraising and spewing sound bites and more time debating issues in good faith to find common ground.

A better politics, that is something all Americans want to see, and there is

no better way to restore their faith in Congress than by getting Big Money out of politics.

Today, my friends, is the 5-year anniversary of the Supreme Court's 5-4 ruling in Citizens United v. FEC, which granted corporations and megamillionaires a First Amendment right to buy unlimited influence in our elections. The results of Citizens United has been elections dominated by super-PACs and unaccountable outside groups, backed by a small group of the wealthiest Americans.

Indeed, during the 2012 Presidential election cycle, 93 percent of super-PAC funding came from just over 3,000 donors, amounting to less than .01 percent of the American population; likewise, the 2014 midterm election cycle was the most expensive in history, with recordbreaking spending by outside groups.

That is why, today, I ask the majority to join me and more than 80 of my colleagues in support of H.J. Res. 22, the Democracy for All amendment. This amendment will restore what the Supreme Court took away in Citizens United: the right of Congress and the States to pass laws limiting the influence of Big Money in our elections.

Seniors on Social Security don't have millions to funnel into super-PACs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DEUTCH. And low-income children are not among the wealthy donors who hit the limits struck down in last year's McCutcheon ruling.

The sad truth is that, for most Americans, their influence in Washington has shrunk each time the Supreme Court has invited more money into our elections and allowed special interests to set the agenda.

Let's build a better politics by bringing H.J. Res. 22, the Democracy for All amendment, up for a vote today. Together, we can ensure that every American's voice, once again, is heard in America's democracy.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on ordering the previous question, so that we can consider the constitutional amendment, the Democracy for All amendment, that would rein in the excesses that have been unleashed by Big Money on our political system. That occurred 5 years ago in the Citizens United decision.

We have an opportunity, acting on behalf of the millions of Americans who feel their voices are drowned out, to push back on the influence of Big Money in this town and on this Chamber.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that every week we get another example of how

Big Money is influencing policy here in Washington. Last week, it was the influence of Wall Street leaning on the institution to pass legislation that would get them out from reasonable regulation. This week, it is the energy industry leaning on the institution with respect to this Keystone bill that we are going to see—example after example of how Big Money has undue influence here in Washington.

It is time that we fought on behalf of the American people and made sure that their voices are the ones being heard, not the voice and the megaphone of Big Money.

Let's vote against ordering the previous question. Let's consider the amendment to the Constitution that would allow us to push back on the undue influence of Big Money here in Washington.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire as to whether the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. FOXX. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. How much time do I have left, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment that I will offer if we defeat the previous question in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just recap for my colleagues here. First of all, vote "no" on this rule. This continues a trend that has nothing but contempt for regular order. These bills had no hearings in this Congress. There was no markup, and now, they are brought to the floor with no amendments—two closed rules.

Notwithstanding the pledge of the Speaker for a more open and transparent process, people who have other ideas on ways to improve or change these bills are denied that opportunity.

I would say, with all due respect to my colleague from North Carolina, we can't use the excuse that we have got to keep the government running. We are in the beginning of the session. We are not doing much of anything. Clearly, the bills that we are debating in their current form are going to be vetoed anyway.

□ 1330

Secondly, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule because of the bills that are being brought up: this bill that is clearly an attack on women's health and reproductive rights,

which does not belong on this floor; and the other bill is a bill that basically allows there to be a process for pipelines to be approved without necessarily going through all the proper oversight.

And I am going to urge Members to vote against the previous question so we can bring up this bill that I talked about earlier on campaign finance reform.

Look, the legislative agenda in this Congress is about rewarding the highest donors. I think to any objective observer, when you see what is coming on the floor, including this pipeline bill which is not in the interest of the American people, we are not out there trying to protect their safety and well-being. It is a big kiss to the energy industry. And I would argue that the reason why bills like that—or some of the tax bills that are brought to this floor that reward big corporations and the wealthiest individuals—are brought to the floor is because those people who represent those wealthy interests have the most sway in this Congress. They are the biggest donors to political parties. They are the biggest donors to Members of Congress.

And while that is happening every day here, average people who can't contribute tens of thousands of dollars to political parties, who can't contribute millions of dollars, are increasingly becoming marginalized. The issues that matter most to working people, those struggling in the working class, those struggling to get into the middle class, we don't even get a chance to debate those issues on the House floor.

I will say to my Republican friends: I have had many conversations with you over the years about how you hate raising money as much as I hate raising money. Too much of our attention in this Congress, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, is about raising money for the next election, and it is getting worse and worse every election cycle. It is time to do something about that. It is time to give Congress the authority to regulate or put a cap on how much campaigns cost. I mean, we are going to spend billions of dollars in the next Presidential election. It is obscene. With all the problems that we have in this country, we ought to be spending more time debating those problems and not worrying about raising money.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can bring up this commonsense campaign finance proposal, and I also urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I said at the opening of this debate, this rule will provide for consideration of H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act. That legislation, which passed the House on a bipartisan basis last Congress, will

reduce red tape and ensure that Americans in all parts of the country will be able to benefit from the energy revolution that has occurred on our Nation's private lands.

It is the coldest season of the year. It is my strong hope that we will be able to enact this legislation soon, to ensure that in winters to come residents of the northeast and other high-cost areas of the country are able to heat their homes affordably.

Before we consider our budgets or the foolishness of red tape, though, we must return to our founding principles. We must remember that life is the most fundamental of all rights. It is sacred and God-given.

Even the President said in last night's speech: "I want our actions to tell every child, in every neighborhood: Your life matters, and we are committed to improving your life chances, as committed as we are to working on behalf of our own kids."

But, Mr. Speaker, millions of babies have been robbed of that right in this, the freest country in the world. That is a tragedy beyond words and a betrayal of what we, as a nation, stand for.

Before liberty, equality, free speech, freedom of conscience, the pursuit of happiness, and justice for all, there has to be life; and yet for millions of aborted infants, life is exactly what they have been denied. An affront to life for some is an affront to life for every one of us.

One day, we hope it will be different. We hope life will cease to be valued on a sliding scale. We hope the era of elective abortions, ushered in by an unelected Court, will be closed and collectively deemed one of the darkest chapters in American history. But until that day, it remains a solemn duty to stand up for life.

Regardless of the length of this journey, we will continue to speak for those who cannot, and we will continue to pray to the One who can change the hearts of those in desperation and those in power who equally hold the lives of the innocent in their hands.

May we, in love, defend the unborn; may we, in humility, confront this national sin; and may we mourn what abortion reveals about the conscience of our Nation. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for life by voting in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my frustration in the process by which this bill was brought to the floor and my disappointment that the process has yielded a bill that I cannot support.

This bill did not go through regular order. The Judiciary Committee did not hold any hearings or markups on the bill. And now under a Closed Rule, Members do not have the opportunity to offer amendments, let alone debate the merits of specific sections they wish to change.

I submitted an amendment to H.R. 36 that would have extended the exception for all incest victims. Under a Closed Rule, this amendment was rejected.

Incest victims are victims regardless of their age. What some people call "consensual incest" often begins as child sexual abuse. Even if the relationship continues into adulthood, there is still a perpetrator and still a victim. In addition, it is hugely unfair to require an incest victim to report a relative to the police.

In the future, should the House again consider legislation railing to abortion, I urge my colleagues to bring the bill through regular order so that all Members can participate in the debate over this sensitive issue.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 38 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 22) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the joint resolution, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 22.

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated

the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. FOXX. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 182, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—238

Abraham	Barletta	Bishop (UT)
Aderholt	Barr	Black
Allen	Barton	Blackburn
Amash	Benishek	Blum
Amodei	Bilirakis	Bost
Babin	Bishop (MI)	Boustany

Brat	Huelskamp	Ratcliffe
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Reed
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Reichert
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Renacci
Buchanan	Hurd (TX)	Ribble
Buck	Hurt (VA)	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Issa	Rigell
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Roby
Byrne	Jenkins (WV)	Roe (TN)
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Carter (GA)	Jolly	Rogers (KY)
Chabot	Jones	Rohrabacher
Chaffetz	Jordan	Rokita
Clawson (FL)	Joyce	Rooney (FL)
Coffman	Katko	Ros-Lehtinen
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Ross
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Rothfus
Comstock	Kinzinger (IL)	Rouzer
Conaway	Kline	Royce
Cook	Knight	Russell
Costello (PA)	Labrador	Ryan (WI)
Cramer	LaMalfa	Salmon
Crawford	Lamborn	Sanford
Crenshaw	Lance	Scalise
Culberson	Latta	Schock
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Schweikert
Davis, Rodney	Long	Scott, Austin
Denham	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Dent	Love	Sessions
DeSantis	Lucas	Shimkus
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Simpson
Dold	MacArthur	Smith (MO)
Duffy	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Smith (TX)
Ellmers	McCarthy	Stefanik
Emmer	McCauley	Stewart
Farenthold	McClintock	Stivers
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Stutzman
Fleischmann	McKinley	Thompson (PA)
Fleming	McMorris	Thornberry
Flores	Rodgers	Tiberi
Fortenberry	McSally	Tipton
Fox	Meadows	Trott
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Turner
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Upton
Garrett	Mica	Valadao
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Wagner
Gibson	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Gohmert	Moolenaar	Walden
Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Walker
Gosar	Mullin	Walorski
Gowdy	Mulvaney	Walters, Mimi
Granger	Murphy (PA)	Weber (TX)
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Webster (FL)
Graves (LA)	Newhouse	Wenstrup
Graves (MO)	Noem	Westerman
Griffith	Nugent	Westmoreland
Grothman	Nunes	Whitfield
Guinta	Olson	Williams
Guthrie	Palazzo	Wilson (SC)
Hanna	Palmer	Wittman
Hardy	Paulsen	Womack
Harper	Pearce	Woodall
Hartzler	Perry	Yoder
Heck (NV)	Pittenger	Yoho
Hensarling	Pitts	Young (AK)
Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)	Young (IA)
Hice (GA)	Poliquin	Young (IN)
Hill	Pompeo	Zeldin
Holding	Possey	Zinke
Hudson	Price (GA)	

NAYS—182

Adams	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Aguilar	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Ashford	Chu (CA)	DeSaulnier
Bass	Cicilline	Deutch
Beatty	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Becerra	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Berra	Clay	Doyle (PA)
Beyer	Cleaver	Ellison
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Engel
Blumenauer	Cohen	Eshoo
Bonamici	Connolly	Esty
Boyle (PA)	Conyers	Farr
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Fattah
Brown (FL)	Costa	Foster
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Frankel (FL)
Bustos	Crowley	Fudge
Butterfield	Cuellar	Gabbard
Capps	Cummings	Galleo
Capuano	Davis (CA)	Garamendi
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny	Graham
Carney	DeFazio	Grayson
Carson (IN)	DeGette	Green, Al
Cartwright	Delaney	Green, Gene

Grijalva	Maloney	Sanchez, Loretta
Gutiérrez	Carolyn	Sarbanes
Hahn	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Heck (WA)	Matsui	Schiff
Higgins	McCollum	Schrader
Himes	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Honda	McGovern	Scott, David
Huffman	McNerney	Serrano
Israel	Meeks	Sewell (AL)
Jackson Lee	Meng	Sherman
Jeffries	Moore	Sinema
Johnson (GA)	Moulton	Sires
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (FL)	Slaughter
Kaptur	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Keating	Napolitano	Speier
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Swalwell (CA)
Kennedy	Nolan	Takai
Kildee	Norcross	Takano
Kilmer	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
Kind	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Kirkpatrick	Pascarella	Titus
Kuster	Payne	Tonko
Langevin	Pelosi	Torres
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Tsongas
Larson (CT)	Peterson	Van Hollen
Lawrence	Pingree	Vargas
Lee	Pocan	Veasey
Levin	Polis	Vela
Lewis	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Lieu (CA)	Quigley	Visclosky
Lipinski	Rangel	Walz
Loeb sack	Rice (NY)	Wasserman
Lofgren	Richmond	Schultz
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine
Lowey	Ruiz	Watson Coleman
Lujan Grisham	Ruppersberger	Welch
(NM)	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Luján, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth
(NM)	Sánchez, Linda	
Lynch	T.	

NOT VOTING—13

Brady (TX)	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Carter (TX)	Harris	Nunnelee
Duckworth	Hastings	Perlmutter
Edwards	Hinojosa	
Fincher	Hoyer	

□ 1404

Messrs. REED and SALMON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 181, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

AYES—238

Abraham	Buchanan	Curbelo (FL)
Aderholt	Buck	Davis, Rodney
Allen	Bucshon	Denham
Amash	Burgess	Dent
Amodei	Byrne	DeSantis
Babin	Calvert	DesJarlais
Barletta	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart
Barr	Chabot	Dold
Barton	Chaffetz	Duffy
Benishek	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (SC)
Bilirakis	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (MI)	Cole	Ellmers
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Emmer
Black	Collins (NY)	Farenthold
Blackburn	Comstock	Fitzpatrick
Blum	Conaway	Fleischmann
Bost	Cook	Fleming
Boustany	Costello (PA)	Flores
Brat	Cramer	Fortenberry
Bridenstine	Crawford	Fox
Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Brooks (IN)	Culberson	Frelinghuysen



Garrett	Lummis	Roskam
Gibbs	MacArthur	Ross
Gibson	Marchant	Rothfus
Gohmert	Marino	Rouzer
Goodlatte	Massie	Royce
Gosar	McCarthy	Russell
Gowdy	McCauley	Ryan (WI)
Granger	McClintock	Salmon
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Sanford
Graves (LA)	McKinley	Scalise
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Schock
Griffith	Rodgers	Schweikert
Grothman	McSally	Scott, Austin
Guinta	Meadows	Sensenbrenner
Guthrie	Meehan	Sessions
Hanna	Messer	Shimkus
Hardy	Mica	Shuster
Harper	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Hartzler	Miller (MI)	Smith (MO)
Heck (NV)	Moolenaar	Smith (NE)
Hensarling	Mooney (WV)	Smith (NJ)
Herrera Beutler	Mullin	Smith (TX)
Hice (GA)	Mulvaney	Stefanik
Hill	Murphy (PA)	Stewart
Holding	Neugebauer	Stivers
Hudson	Newhouse	Stutzman
Huelskamp	Noem	Thompson (PA)
Huizenga (MI)	Nugent	Thornberry
Hultgren	Nunes	Tiberi
Hunter	Olson	Tipton
Hurd (TX)	Palazzo	Trott
Hurt (VA)	Palmer	Turner
Issa	Paulsen	Upton
Jenkins (KS)	Pearce	Valadao
Jenkins (WV)	Perry	Wagner
Johnson (OH)	Peterson	Walberg
Jolly	Pittenger	Walden
Jones	Pitts	Walker
Jordan	Poe (TX)	Walorski
Joyce	Poliquin	Weber (TX)
Katko	Pompeo	Webster (FL)
Kelly (PA)	Posey	Wenstrup
King (IA)	Price (GA)	Westerman
King (NY)	Ratcliffe	Westmoreland
Kinzinger (IL)	Reed	Whitfield
Kline	Reichert	Williams
Knight	Renacci	Wilson (SC)
Labrador	Ribble	Wittman
LaMalfa	Rice (SC)	Womack
Lamborn	Rigell	Woodall
Lance	Roby	Yoder
Latta	Roe (TN)	Yoho
LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)
Long	Rogers (KY)	Young (IA)
Loudermilk	Rohrabacher	Young (IN)
Love	Rokita	Zeldin
Lucas	Rooney (FL)	Zinke
Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen	

## NOES—181

Adams	Cuellar	Jackson Lee
Aguilar	Cummings	Jeffries
Ashford	Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)
Bass	Davis, Danny	Johnson, E. B.
Beatty	DeFazio	Kaptur
Becerra	DeGette	Keating
Bera	Delaney	Kelly (IL)
Beyer	DeLauro	Kennedy
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Kildee
Blumenauer	DeSaulnier	Kilmer
Bonamici	Deutch	Kind
Boyle (PA)	Dingell	Kirkpatrick
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Kuster
Brown (FL)	Doyle (PA)	Langevin
Brownley (CA)	Ellison	Larsen (WA)
Bustos	Engel	Larson (CT)
Butterfield	Eshoo	Lawrence
Capps	Esty	Lee
Capuano	Farr	Levin
Cárdenas	Fattah	Lewis
Carney	Foster	Lieu (CA)
Carson (IN)	Frankel (FL)	Lipinski
Cartwright	Fudge	Loeb
Castor (FL)	Gabbard	Lofgren
Castro (TX)	Gallagher	Lowenthal
Chu (CA)	Garamendi	Lowe
Cicilline	Graham	Lujan Grisham
Clark (MA)	Grayson	(NM)
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	Luján, Ben Ray
Clay	Green, Gene	(NM)
Cleaver	Grijalva	Lynch
Clyburn	Gutiérrez	Maloney,
Cohen	Hahn	Carolyn
Connolly	Heck (WA)	Maloney, Sean
Conyers	Higgins	Matsui
Cooper	Himes	McCollum
Costa	Honda	McDermott
Courtney	Huffman	McGovern
Crowley	Israel	McNerney

Meeks	Richmond	Swalwell (CA)
Meng	Roybal-Allard	Takai
Moore	Ruiz	Takano
Moulton	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Murphy (FL)	Rush	Thompson (MS)
Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Titus
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Tonko
Neal	T.	Torres
Nolan	Sanchez, Loretta	Tsongas
Norcross	Sarbanes	Van Hollen
O'Rourke	Schakowsky	Vargas
Pallone	Schiff	Veasey
Pascarell	Schrader	Vela
Payne	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Pelosi	Scott, David	Visclosky
Peters	Serrano	Walz
Pingree	Sewell (AL)	Wasserman
Pocan	Sherman	Schultz
Polis	Sinema	Waters, Maxine
Price (NC)	Sires	Watson Coleman
Quigley	Slaughter	Welch
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Wilson (FL)
Rice (NY)	Speier	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—14

Brady (TX)	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Carter (TX)	Harris	Nunnelee
Duckworth	Hastings	Perlmutter
Edwards	Hinojosa	Walters, Mimi
Fincher	Hoyer	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1413

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

## NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 38, I call up the bill (H.R. 161) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 38, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 161

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act”.

## SEC. 2. REGULATORY APPROVAL OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROJECTS.

Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717f) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1)(1) The Commission shall approve or deny an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for a prefilled project not later than 12 months after receiving a complete application that is ready to be processed, as defined by the Commission by regulation.

“(2) The agency responsible for issuing any license, permit, or approval required under Federal law in connection with a prefilled project for which a certificate of public convenience and necessity is sought under this

Act shall approve or deny the issuance of the license, permit, or approval not later than 90 days after the Commission issues its final environmental document relating to the project.

“(3) The Commission may extend the time period under paragraph (2) by 30 days if an agency demonstrates that it cannot otherwise complete the process required to approve or deny the license, permit, or approval, and therefor will be compelled to deny the license, permit, or approval. In granting an extension under this paragraph, the Commission may offer technical assistance to the agency as necessary to address conditions preventing the completion of the review of the application for the license, permit, or approval.

“(4) If an agency described in paragraph (2) does not approve or deny the issuance of the license, permit, or approval within the time period specified under paragraph (2) or (3), as applicable, such license, permit, or approval shall take effect upon the expiration of 30 days after the end of such period. The Commission shall incorporate into the terms of such license, permit, or approval any conditions proffered by the agency described in paragraph (2) that the Commission does not find are inconsistent with the final environmental document.

“(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘prefilled project’ means a project for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of a natural gas pipeline with respect to which a prefiling docket number has been assigned by the Commission pursuant to a prefiling process established by the Commission for the purpose of facilitating the formal application process for obtaining a certificate of public convenience and necessity.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 161.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to natural gas production, we are number one. What was once a pipe dream is now a global reality, thanks to American ingenuity and technology. An impressive accomplishment, especially considering where we were only a decade ago—fearful of running out of supplies.

With this new wealth of natural gas, folks in Michigan and across the country should no longer worry about access to affordable energy. But budget-busting power bills are still hitting too many Americans.

The New York Times recently reported that customers in New England could expect electricity rates to spike

close to 40 percent higher this winter. Why? Well, we may have fixed our supply problems, but now we have a serious distribution problem. Our archaic energy infrastructure and outdated regulatory system is blocking American consumers from reaping the benefits of our energy abundance. We have the gas, but we don't have the pipelines to get cheap energy directly to families and businesses that need it most.

This legislation seeks to fix the problem, inserting accountability into the permitting process for natural gas pipelines and establishing firm deadlines for agency reviews. It does not exempt any environmental laws. It just makes sure pipeline projects get sited and built without unnecessary delay.

Last night, the President here made the case for more Federal funding of transportation infrastructure projects like roads and bridges as one way to create jobs while modernizing our economy. But the energy infrastructure projects unleashed by this pipeline bill are every bit as necessary, with all of the economic benefits, and the best part is, since they will be paid for by the private sector, it won't cost taxpayers a dime.

We voted on this legislation last Congress, and it passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support. With the President's comments last night about wanting to work with Congress, I hope the President can join us in supporting this bipartisan, commonsense energy and jobs solution. Now that we are the leader in energy production, there is no reason America shouldn't be number one in energy affordability as well.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, when he said that the likelihood is that we are going to have more and more pipelines constructed, pipelines that have to go through the FERC process, and that is certainly true, but all the more reason why we shouldn't be voting or supporting this bill.

I have to say I am talking not just in general in the abstract but from personal experience. In my district a few years ago, when I was a Congressman, in Edison, New Jersey, we had a natural gas pipeline explosion. Fortunately, no one was killed or seriously injured, but a whole apartment complex was wiped out, not just one building but a series of them. There was a real danger of loss of life.

It scares me, Mr. Speaker, to think that we would want to change the process whereby FERC has the opportunity to look at the safety of these pipelines when they are proposed for permitting and somehow short-circuit that process because of my own experience in my congressional district in Edison, New Jersey. Durham Woods was the name of the complex.

So many of these pipelines, as a lot more pipelines are being built, a lot of

them are in densely populated areas. So it is a major concern that FERC has to look at when reviewing these pipelines and deciding whether to issue a permit. It is not as if they are in places with no people. They are often in densely populated areas, like in my State of New Jersey.

In addition, this bill is unnecessary. The nonpartisan Government Accountability Office concluded that the FERC pipeline permitting process is predictable and consistent and gets pipelines built. In fact, over 90 percent are approved or at least decided within the 12-month cycle limitation that this bill is proposing.

The pipeline companies actually testified before the GAO that the process for permitting through FERC "is generally very good" and that the sector "enjoys a favorable legal and regulatory framework for the approval of new infrastructure."

So if the process is fine, why are we now trying to move ahead and endanger safety by coming up with limitations on the process that actually is very good?

I would also say that if you have a 12-month limit, which is what this bill proposes on FERC's ability to issue a permit, it is very possible that the process of permitting could be slowed down because if FERC decides that they don't have enough time within 12 months to decide whether a pipeline should be built and it is safe, they may just decide to not grant the permit and deny it for fear that they haven't had enough time to deal with it over the 12 months. I think it is not only unnecessary, but it may actually even be counterproductive to what the sponsors are trying to accomplish.

I would also point out that we are wasting our time because the President has issued a Statement of Administration Policy saying that if H.R. 161 were to reach his desk, that he would actually veto it. I am not going to get into all the specifics of why because I think they are a lot of the same reasons I am mentioning myself.

Now, let me say what happens. When faced with this 12-month deadline, not only FERC but also other agencies that deal with the Clean Air Act or the Clean Water Act or the Endangered Species Act, other agencies that have the authority to review this and permit this under the bill, would actually only have 3 months, 90 days. So after the 12-month period ends for FERC, then there is a 90-day period for the other agencies to act. And if they don't act within 90 days, then FERC is required under this legislation to issue a permit and say that those other regulatory concerns are met.

So now you are going to have FERC not only limited in its 12-month review but also then issuing permits under the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and these other environmental regulations, which it has nothing to do with. Essentially you are saying the other agencies have no role anymore because if

they don't decide within 90 days, FERC has to approve those permits as well. FERC doesn't normally deal with these other issues.

Another thing which I think is important is the eminent domain issue. If the permit is approved by FERC, then that means the company that is building the pipeline has the right to use eminent domain for the land where the pipeline is going to go through. I have a lot of concern about whether or not eminent domain should be used in those circumstances, particularly if the permit process has been short-circuited.

So I think that sometimes my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't understand that these permits are very detailed documents. They include emission limits, technology operating requirements, conditions to protect the environment. FERC doesn't have the expertise or the resources to issue the permits for these other statutes like the Clean Air Act and the Endangered Species Act.

So I am just saying that I think that this legislation from a practical point of view is entirely unworkable. It just doesn't work. It doesn't work. The GAO has said that the process that we have now is fine. And for those of us who have had these accidents where we have had explosions and danger, the last thing that we want is these pipelines going through densely populated areas that haven't had the proper review to protect the safety and the health of our residents. For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) who is the author of H.R. 161.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I rise in support of H.R. 161.

We are tens of thousands of miles of pipeline capacity short of the necessary pipelines to carry natural gas to consumers who need it and businesses who demand it today in America. You don't have to take my word for it—prices will tell you.

The gentleman from New Jersey just said he opposes this bill. Allow him to explain to his constituents why they pay six or seven or eight times as much for natural gas as someone else in the Midwest, or in places where there is adequate pipeline capacity today. It is unnecessary; it is unconscionable. America now has the resources to provide this gas to all Americans so they can heat their homes and cool their homes, so businesses can use natural gas to build products here in America. We no longer live in a world with energy scarcity here in America. We have an opportunity to get this product from where it is found to the consumers and businesses that are demanding it.

The other side of the aisle may tell you we don't have a problem, but I will

tell you that as you talk to your constituents, as one who does this all the time, constituents say: I am paying too much for my product. This is a solution that will work.

We don't make in this legislation a single change to the Clean Water Act, not one change to the Clean Air Act, not a single change to any legislation that has to do with pipeline safety. Not one. All those laws remain in effect. All we ask the government to do is its job. We give them a timeline. We give them ample time. If 12 months is not enough, I am happy to give them 13. We will change the legislation.

But, in fact, the opposition isn't because this is being rushed but because in fact this will speed the process. That is why folks are opposed. They know this will produce this gas in a way that is safe and reasonable, and we will have great outcomes. And yet they want to keep this product in the ground. That is the real reason for opposition to this bill.

So those of us who want to get this energy to the consumers, to where it needs to go, I urge them to support this.

Frankly, when you read the articles about the challenges of pipeline capacity in America, the place it impacts the most isn't the place from which I hail. It is not Kansas; it is not the Midwest. It is, in fact, the densely populated areas of the Northeast. They are the places that need this energy the most and the soonest and the safest, and we can get it for them. I urge those who live in those places to talk to their constituents and to do the work to make sure that they understand what H.R. 161 can accomplish for the people in the areas that they represent.

You know, this administration has taken a lot of efforts to reduce the capacity of coal to provide energy for businesses and consumers. I regret that. I am doing my best to push back in every place that we can, as I know our chairman is as well. But as coal-fired power plants become more difficult to build, the need for natural gas will become even more increased.

□ 1430

This legislation is aimed directly at making sure that we don't have shortages and outages and catastrophes in energy production and energy delivery that America cannot afford.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 161.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 161, the so-called Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

My home State of Massachusetts, like many areas around the country, faces serious energy challenges. We need careful and strategic long-term planning in order to lower energy prices and increase reliability. Increasing

access to additional sources of natural gas could help address some of New England's energy challenges, including energy prices, which have historically been above the national average.

However, this legislation would move us in the wrong direction. This bill would force FERC to rush decision-making, including environmental reviews and assessments of the need for natural gas, while also hobbling decisions regarding the appropriate size of the proposed pipeline. It would turn FERC into a superpermitting agency, an authority that FERC neither wants nor has the expertise to carry out.

In my home district, we are currently navigating the FERC process that this bill purports to improve. The company is proposing to build a new 250-mile natural gas pipeline that crosses three States, including seven communities that I represent. I have heard from hundreds of my constituents expressing their concerns with this project.

Construction of the pipeline could jeopardize local wildlife and will impact both State and federally designated conservation lands, as well as Massachusetts' scarce farmland.

Thanks to extensive public review and input, the pipeline route has already been adjusted to minimize some of the environmental impacts, but there are still many outstanding concerns that deserve careful scrutiny. The proposed route still passes through local farmland, parks, wildlife management areas, wetlands, near schools, and across drinking water supplies.

My constituents have been grateful for a process that has given them the time to provide input. This bill would short-circuit that process and short-change my constituents' right to be heard.

I proposed an amendment to this legislation with my colleague Mr. McGovern that would exempt any pipeline from the arbitrary timelines established in the bill if the proposed route crosses Federal, State, or local land designated for conservation or recreation. However, the majority blocked this simple amendment from coming to the floor and receiving an up-or-down vote.

In Massachusetts, we have a long-standing history of preserving national habitats and protecting open spaces for the public benefit, and we have invested significant public resources towards these goals. Members should have been given the opportunity to vote on whether or not we should allow for a thorough review process to protect State investments.

On behalf of my constituents, I ask my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

Increased production of American natural gas has led to lower prices and more demand for this energy source all across the Nation. That is especially true in cold, energy-dependent regions like upstate New York and the Northeast. We need new infrastructure, specifically pipelines, to safely transport fuels to markets where they are needed.

Unfortunately, the Government Accountability Office reported that an average processing time for interstate natural gas pipeline projects was 558 days. This bill would expedite the government's review process for pipeline applications, to make sure that we are doing all we can to build infrastructure in a timely and responsible manner.

More access to affordable American natural gas will help fuel farms, heat homes, and power small businesses in upstate New York and throughout this country. Building pipelines will create good-paying jobs, as well as boost revenues and development in communities across the Nation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Some of my Republican colleagues just suggested that this bill would not waive any environmental requirements. For instance, yesterday, at the Rules Committee, the sponsor of the legislation indicated that H.R. 161 did not waive or alter any applicable environmental requirements under the Clean Air Act or NEPA.

While it is true that this legislation does not actually amend any provisions of the Clean Air Act or other environmental statutes, the bill would require automatic issuance of a pipeline-related permit under statutes like the Clean Air Act, if the responsible agency, such as EPA, has failed to act within the 90 days. This is the 90 days beyond the 1 year that I mentioned before.

Basically, that makes FERC the agency that would issue the Clean Air Act permit. Under this bill, FERC would decide how to create a BLM right-of-way permit or a Clean Water Act discharge permit. As a result, the legislation would effectively override the permitting decisions of agencies like EPA or DOI and turn FERC into a superpermitting agency.

I just want to point out, while it is true that the text of the actual Clean Air Act might remain unchanged under this bill, the effect of the bill would be that the Clean Air Act permits would be automatically issued by FERC if EPA fails to act within 90 days.

That is a major and substantive change from the way these laws work and, in effect, amounts to a waiver of environmental requirements for all practical purposes, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time we have remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 24 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to clarify that H.R. 161 is certainly not any drastic piece of legislation.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 designated the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as the lead agency charged with coordinating and reviewing natural gas pipeline project applications; therefore, FERC conducts the environmental review of each project as required under the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, and is given authority to set deadlines for other agencies to issue an approval or denial of an associated permit.

When these applications are filed at FERC, the application also is given to other agencies that may have jurisdiction over the Clean Water Act, maybe like the Corps of Engineers, the Clean Air Act, the EPA perhaps, or Endangered Species; so it is not like they just have 90 days to look at this. They get the application the same time as FERC does.

The problem that FERC has had—and they have had both Democrat and Republican Commissioners come to Congress and say that they need more authority over these other agencies, so this bill does precisely that.

Once FERC has made a final determination and completed its process, it gives the other agencies another 90 days—even though they have been working on it for a year in advance of that—another 90 days to complete it, and if they want another 30 days, then they can do that as well.

I would just say that this is not rushing the process; it is simply completing the 2005 Energy Policy Act that gives FERC authority. We give them authority, but we don't give them any enforcement mechanism, and so this is precisely what this legislation does.

I might also add that having deadlines for agencies to act when doing environmental reviews or issuing permits is not really that strange or unique of an idea. Canada, Australia, and most European Union nations have deadlines for their environmental regulatory agencies to act.

Any person that is doing any kind of business in America knows the bureaucracy that we all run into, and it is easy to criticize bureaucracies. We know that they are dedicated, committed citizens trying to protect the environment, protect the American people, and we commend them for doing that, but we also know that they frequently let things slide.

It is easy to lose the process. We hear common complaints—nonstop—about delay, delay, delay. We know from hearings on this—this bill has already passed the House once—but we know from hearings that the Northeastern United States is really vulnerable to not having sufficient natural gas to meet their needs.

They are closing nuclear power plants. The President is making sure

you can't build a new coal plant in America. Existing coal plants, many of them are going to be going out of business because of extreme regulations of this climate-driven administration. We have heard testimony about the escalating prices of electricity for people.

This is designed to provide the infrastructure to get the natural gas where it needs to be, and the Northeast is one of those areas. That is really what this bill is about. It is about giving FERC some real authority, setting in statute that these agencies must act within a certain amount of time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I really don't understand. I respect my colleague from Kentucky a great deal, but he seems to be arguing that we need the deadlines in this bill to hold Federal agencies accountable and ensure that they don't just somehow sit on the applications.

As I have already noted, since 2009, FERC has completed action on 91 percent of natural gas pipeline applications within 12 months, so a 12-month deadline isn't needed for more than 90 percent of the applicants.

My colleagues have asked: Well, what is the problem with holding the remaining 9 percent to a 12-month deadline? Well, the problem is it becomes a one-size-fits-all approach that fails to consider a wide range of applications that FERC has to review.

Some of the applications are for new projects—again, a small number—which span hundreds of miles, cross waterways and wetlands, and pass through neighborhoods and habitats of threatened wildlife; and questions of eminent domain need to be considered. In these cases, there can be unresolved safety, environmental, and legal issues at the local or State level.

Again, as I said, the President has said that he would veto this bill. In the Statement of Administration Policy, they specifically say:

The small percentage of decisions that have taken longer than 1 year involve complex proposals that merit additional review and consideration.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a complex project or there is some unaddressed risk to safety or the environment, we need to allow FERC or other Federal agencies the time to ensure that the pipeline is safe, so we don't have an accident like what occurred in Edison, New Jersey, in my district.

The last thing anyone needs, including the pipeline owner, is a pipeline explosion or other dangerous pipeline malfunction, and these things have occurred. I witnessed it myself in my district.

I am just saying don't put a hard deadline on the most complex projects that raise the possibility that FERC will be forced to approve a pipeline that is not safe or to reject an application solely because the Commission lacks sufficient time for an adequate review that will hinder rather than

help us get more natural gas where it needs to go.

Now, my colleague also mentioned the issue about the Northeast electricity supply or prices, and I just wanted to address that concern. New England is using more natural gas to generate electricity and more natural gas for heating homes than in the past, and on the coldest winter days, when natural gas is needed for heating or electricity, there is more demand, but this bill doesn't do anything to solve that problem.

The problem in New England isn't caused by pipeline applications that take too long to get approved by FERC; the problem is that the pipeline companies aren't even submitting the applications because they haven't figured out who is going to pay for these new pipelines. The pipeline companies haven't been satisfied there is a sufficient year-round demand to justify and finance the pipelines.

That is an issue that FERC is looking at and has been holding stakeholder conferences about, but this has nothing to do with Mr. POMPEO's bill.

□ 1445

Cutting corners on the permitting process isn't going to help additional pipeline capacity built for the Northeast. I don't think we ought to be blaming the government for every problem, which is what I hear my colleagues on the Republican side doing. The reality is that FERC and the government didn't create this problem. It is a problem of economics, and the faster we understand that the faster we can try to find a solution, but let's not act as if FERC's inability to act is the problem here. That is not the case.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When we had hearings on this bill, the natural gas pipeline industry estimated that by the year 2035 an estimated \$8 billion each year would need to be spent to keep pace with the anticipated need for more pipeline infrastructure.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is absolutely correct in that Congress can't make these decisions. Private companies have to make the decision if they are going to invest the dollars to build these pipelines, but they have talked to us—the FERC Commissioners have talked to us—about the fact that some of these agencies are just delaying for no apparent reason. As I said earlier, when the application is filed at FERC, the other agencies receive those applications, and they have the same amount of time to work on it. This legislation simply sets some guidelines for these Federal agencies so that, when FERC completes its chore—and it is the quarterback in the decision of approving these pipelines—these agencies must also step up to the plate.

This legislation is not radical in any way. It is certainly not rushing the

process. It is not doing that. Pursuant to the 2005 Energy Policy Act, it is simply making it a more efficient, speedy process while, at the same time, protecting the environment and the best interests of the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New Jersey have additional speakers?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I do not, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am not going to read the whole thing, Mr. Speaker, but I did just want to make reference to some part of the Statement of Administration Policy's saying that the President would veto the bill:

The administration recognizes the need for additional energy infrastructure and supports the timely consideration of project applications. The administration, however, strongly opposes the bill because it would allow the automatic approval of natural gas pipeline projects if the FERC or other Federal agencies do not issue the required permit, license, or approval within rigid, unworkable timeframes.

H.R. 161 could create conflicts with existing statutory and regulatory requirements and practices and preclude opportunities for engaging the public and potentially impacted communities, thereby causing confusion and the risk of increased litigation. The bill's requirements could force agencies to make decisions based on incomplete information or information that may not be available, including potential environmental and community impacts of the proposed pipelines, within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved but for the lack of sufficient review time. For these reasons, the bill may actually delay projects or lead to more project denials, undermining the intent of the legislation.

I stress to my colleagues on the other side that we understand there is a need for more pipelines, and we understand that these pipelines have to be approved in a timely fashion, but there is no reason to believe that that is not happening now. The danger here is that, in a case when these do have to have a more intensive review because of safety or health or environmental concerns, we may actually do the opposite. Either they are going to be denied because the agencies don't have enough time, or, God forbid, they get approved when they shouldn't be.

Again, I just don't quite understand what this is all about. It seems like the Republicans have a bill that they think is going to accomplish their goal and won't but that has a danger of really risking the safety of residents, and I have already witnessed that in the case of a pipeline explosion in my district.

I just think that what the Republicans are doing is blaming FERC and that they are trying to come up with a solution for a problem that doesn't exist; but in the process of all of that, they are going to jeopardize the possibility of the fact that some of these pipelines might be approved without enough safety or environmental or health concerns. It seems to me that it makes no sense at all to put FERC in

the position of deciding issues with regard to statutes like the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act, which they really have nothing to do with.

We considered this bill in the last Congress, Mr. Speaker, and FERC made it clear that it was not necessary or helpful, and the administration threatened to veto the bill. Nothing has changed. The administration has again threatened to veto this bill. It is very early in this new Congress. I remain committed to developing sound energy policy with my Republican colleagues. If they want to have some hearings on this bill and go through the regular order of the committee process, that is fine as there will be more opportunity to review it.

I don't think this bill will help anyone, but I think it may hurt a lot of people, including those who want to build the pipeline. Instead of spending our time debating a bill that will never become law, I hope we can begin soon to have some serious discussion about sound and sustainable energy policy. In the meantime, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this particular piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in summation, I urge the passage of H.R. 161, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would note once again that, during the hearings on this legislation, Commissioners at FERC—both Republican and Democrat—said that more accountability was needed for agencies that issue permits that are necessary to construct natural gas pipelines.

Many people have raised the issue that the President has said he would veto this bill. That is his job, that is his responsibility, and that is the type of government we have. We have a legislative branch, we have an executive branch, and we have a judiciary branch. The legislative branch's responsibility is to pass legislation that it deems necessary. If the President wants to veto it, let him veto it and give his reasons. Then the American people can listen to both sides and decide what they think is the right direction to go.

I would stress once more that the Energy Information Agency data from last year's winter cold snap during the month of January showed that residential natural gas prices in Pennsylvania were 14 percent above the national average; in New Jersey, 18 percent higher; in New York, 24 percent higher; in Vermont, 60 percent higher. One of the reasons given is the lack of infrastructure to get natural gas to where it needs to go in the Northeast.

This is a commonsense bill that is being presented to help solve this problem of energy needs in America. If we are going to be competitive in the global marketplace, yes, we need good, low-cost residential electricity prices, but we also need low-cost manufacturing and heavy industry electricity prices in

order to compete in the global marketplace. That is what H.R. 161 is about, and I would urge Members to support this legislation that was drafted by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 161, a bill that claims to expedite applications for construction of natural gas pipelines in the United States.

First, let me say as a native Houstonian and as a Democrat, I support American energy development.

The energy revolution that has taken place over the last decade is unlike anything I've seen in my lifetime.

The natural gas plays currently developed in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Texas are solely responsible for the recovery the U.S. has seen.

Low natural gas prices have given our industries an advantage over international competitors.

Low natural gas prices have given our homeowners cheaper electric bills.

Low natural gas prices have resulted in lower emissions and smaller contributions to climate change.

To reap those benefits, however, we need pipelines to move that product from the field to market.

I can confidently say, I am a big supporter of pipelines.

The stacks of raw materials and finished pipe in my district are probably unlike any other district in the country.

Pipelines are the most economically efficient and environmentally sound method of moving oil and natural.

I am an advocate of building more pipelines.

I have co-sponsored legislation to build domestic and international pipelines to facilitate energy development.

I have advocated for expediting the application process, so that our federal agencies provide private investors certainty.

Unfortunately, I cannot support H.R. 161.

While I am an advocate of all things natural gas, I am not in favor of completely circumventing the permitting process.

About a decade ago, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), which has jurisdiction over pipeline approvals, had some issues.

We worked closely with the industry and the agency to improve the processes and timelines so that we could get pipe built in this country quickly.

FERC has done an admirable job working with industry and other key stakeholders to improve the process.

Currently, FERC approves the majority of permits in less than 18-to-24 months.

Where there are problems and delays with other permits, namely at the local and state level and FERC is working to resolve those issues.

Unfortunately, this bill does nothing to address those issues.

This bill sets a timeline for FERC and if that timeline expires, then any permit is approved.

Our federal agencies have an oversight role to play and allowing permit applications to essentially "run out the clock" when issues arise is a way to circumvent our federal process.

In Energy and Commerce, we put a lot of work into this bill and I want to thank my colleagues for working closely with our side.

But, I cannot support H.R. 161 and I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 38, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PALLONE. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Pallone moves to recommit the bill H.R. 161 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

#### SEC. 3. PIPELINE OWNER RESPONSIBILITY IN THE EVENT OF AN EXPLOSION.

The provisions of this Act shall not take effect unless the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, in consultation with appropriate regulatory agencies, determines that in the implementation of this Act—

(1) taxpayers will not be held liable for any repair or environmental cleanup from a natural gas pipeline explosion; and

(2) pipeline owners will bear full responsibility for damages in any community resulting from a natural gas pipeline explosion, including for loss of life.

Mr. WHITFIELD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned during the general debate, I and my constituents witnessed and went through a few years ago, when I was in Congress, a natural gas pipeline explosion. It was devastating to the community. We had many people who lost their homes. It was, actually, several apartment buildings. Even to this day, the memory of that is very much ingrained in the minds of the residents of Durham Woods, which is the largest municipality that I represent in Edison, New Jersey.

Basically, what we are saying in this motion to recommit is that the provisions of this act will not take effect unless the FERC determines that taxpayers will not be held liable for any repair or environmental cleanup from a gas pipeline explosion and that the pipeline owners will bear full responsibility for the damage to the community resulting from a natural gas pipeline explosion, including loss of life. It seems to me that that is the minimum we should expect when there is such an explosion.

Believe me. At the time that that explosion occurred in Durham Woods in my district, there were many instances when we had to have environmental cleanups and when the community was exposed to tremendous damage. It seems to me that, under the circumstances, this motion to recommit makes perfect sense.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that there have been many pipeline explosions, but I am not going to go through the entire list. In fact, the one in my district is one that is mentioned here. Beginning in just the last 10 or 15 years, there have been numerous explosions, so we are not talking about something that doesn't happen.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, natural gas pipeline explosions do happen.

Last week, a pipeline exploded in Mississippi. Last year, pipelines exploded in Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Kentucky. In 2013, a pipeline south of Dallas exploded. Reports described the massive explosion as "shooting flames high in the air and prompting evacuations from nearby homes and a school district," with black smoke visible for some 20 miles. In 2010, a natural gas pipeline exploded in San Bruno, California, in my home State, causing an explosion that killed eight people and destroyed 38 homes. Even as technology has improved, pipelines have failed.

We should make clear with this legislation that, in the event of the catastrophic failure of a pipeline, taxpayers are not liable for the hundreds of millions or billions of dollars in damages that these explosions can cause. Companies are responsible for the safety and reliability of their pipelines, and we should ensure that they are also liable for the damages caused by those pipelines.

□ 1500

Last year, when this very bill came before the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the president of the Pipeline Safety Trust testified. This group is a national, independent, nonprofit watchdog organization created using funds from a settlement reached in the aftermath of a pipeline explosion in Washington State that killed three people. The Trust's president testified that "rushed, or worse, incomplete reviews resulting in automatic approvals pose a threat to public safety."

To be clear, this is not an organization that opposes new pipelines. They only focus on pipeline safety, and they have serious problems with this bill and its effects on public safety for new pipelines. Their president pointed out that this bill treats a "10-mile pipeline across a barren desert the same as a 1,400-mile pipeline that crosses multiple ecosystems and through dense population areas where it could pose a threat to the life or property of citizens living nearby."

Mr. Speaker, pipelines can fail. And those failures can have disastrous ef-

fects on communities and the environment. This commonsense amendment would protect taxpayers from ever having to pay the costs of a pipeline explosion. I hope we never see another natural gas pipeline explosion, but that would require that history not repeat itself.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit and to vote against the underlying bill because of the danger it poses to the communities and the environment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, once again, I listened to my colleague from California talk about the dangers from pipelines. These dangers are real. We have had many explosions over the years, including in my own district. I think this bill really puts at risk the possibility of another pipeline explosion. It doesn't provide for enough safety or environmental review.

I urge that Members support the motion to recommit because, at a minimum, it would provide some liability in some way to effectuate a cleanup and pay for the damages that come from an explosion that might take place.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from New York for raising this safety issue because, obviously, safety is of paramount importance to all of us. That is why we do have the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or PHMSA, which has the responsibility of making sure that these pipelines operate in as safe a manner as possible. We also recognize that we never get to a point where it is absolutely safe.

Really, H.R. 161 does not have anything to do with PHMSA. Our committee does have jurisdiction over PHMSA. We have had a lot of hearings on it. We are going to continue to have hearings because we want to maximize pipeline safety.

This legislation is not about anything except perfecting the 2005 Energy Policy Act that gave FERC the quarterbacking authority for approving these natural gas pipelines from the aspect of their impact on clean water, clean air, and endangered species.

And so this legislation simply gives FERC the authority that many of its Commissioners asked for, and that is that they have some authority to convince these agencies to start looking at the impacts of the applications earlier in the process rather than at the end. And so even after the 1-year process is over, they still have 90 days. They may ask for another 30 days.

Because of that reason—that this is not a pipeline safety bill, it is a process



bill—I would respectfully request that we defeat this motion to recommit. And I look forward to working with the gentleman from New Jersey and others on pipeline safety as we have hearings and legislation about PHMSA.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 241, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—182

Adams	Foster	Meeks
Aguilar	Frankel (FL)	Meng
Ashford	Fudge	Moore
Bass	Gabbard	Moulton
Beatty	Gallego	Murphy (FL)
Becerra	Garamendi	Nadler
Bera	Graham	Napolitano
Beyer	Grayson	Neal
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Nolan
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Norcross
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Boyle (PA)	Hahn	Pallone
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pascarell
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Payne
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Pelosi
Bustos	Honda	Peters
Butterfield	Hoyer	Peterson
Capps	Huffman	Pingree
Capuano	Israel	Pocan
Cardenas	Jackson Lee	Polis
Carney	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Castor (FL)	Jones	Rice (NY)
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Richmond
Chu (CA)	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Ciçilline	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Rush
Clay	Kilmer	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	T.
Cohen	Kuster	Sanchez, Loretta
Connolly	Langevin	Sarbanes
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Costa	Lawrence	Schrader
Courtney	Lee	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Levin	Scott, David
Cuellar	Lewis	Serrano
Cummings	Lieu (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Loebach	Sinema
DeFazio	Lofgren	Sires
DeGette	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Delaney	Lowey	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Speier
DelBene	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
DeSaulnier	Lujan, Ben Ray	Takai
Deutch	(NM)	Takano
Dingell	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Doyle (PA)	Carolyn	Titus
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Ellison	Matsui	Torres
Engel	McCollum	Tsongas
Eshoo	McDermott	Van Hollen
Esty	McGovern	Vargas
Fattah	McNerney	Veasey

Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emmer  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garratt  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graham  
Grassley  
Guthrie  
Hahn  
Hartzer  
Harris  
Hatch  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (TX)  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
McMurrin  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry

Carter (TX)  
Duckworth  
Farr  
Forbes

Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman

NAYS—241

Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (TX)  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
McMurrin  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry

NOT VOTING—10

Hastings  
Hinojosa  
Johnson, Sam  
Nunnelee

Welch  
Yarmuth

Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry

YODER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Messrs. RUPPERS-BERGER, JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. CUELLAR changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 169, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—253

Abraham	Fincher	Loudermilk
Aderholt	Fitzpatrick	Love
Allen	Fleischmann	Lucas
Amash	Fleming	Luetkemeyer
Amodei	Flores	Lummis
Ashford	Fortenberry	MacArthur
Babin	Fox	Marchant
Barletta	Franks (AZ)	Marino
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Massie
Barton	Garrett	McCarthy
Benishek	Gibbs	McCaul
Bilirakis	Gibson	McClintock
Bishop (MI)	Gohmert	McHenry
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	McKinley
Black	Gosar	McMorris
Blackburn	Gowdy	Rodgers
Blum	Graham	McSally
Bost	Granger	Meadows
Boustany	Graves (GA)	Meehan
Boyle (PA)	Graves (LA)	Messer
Brady (PA)	Graves (MO)	Mica
Brady (TX)	Griffith	Miller (FL)
Bridenstine	Grothman	Miller (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Guinta	Moolenaar
Brooks (IN)	Guthrie	Mooney (WV)
Buchanan	Hanna	Mullin
Buck	Hardy	Mulvaney
Bucshon	Harper	Murphy (FL)
Burgess	Harris	Murphy (PA)
Bustos	Hartzler	Neugebauer
Byrne	Heck (NV)	Newhouse
Calvert	Hensarling	Noem
Carter (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Norcross
Chabot	Hice (GA)	Nugent
Chaffetz	Hill	Nunes
Clawson (FL)	Holding	Olson
Coffman	Hudson	Palazzo
Cole	Huelskamp	Palmer
Collins (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen
Collins (NY)	Hultgren	Pearce
Comstock	Hunter	Perry
Conaway	Hurd (TX)	Peters
Cook	Hurt (VA)	Peterson
Costa	Issa	Pittenger
Costello (PA)	Jenkins (KS)	Pitts
Cramer	Jenkins (WV)	Poe (TX)
Crawford	Johnson (OH)	Poliquin
Crenshaw	Jolly	Pompeo
Cuellar	Jones	Posey
Culberson	Jordan	Price (GA)
Curbelo (FL)	Joyce	Ratcliffe
Davis, Rodney	Katko	Reed
Denham	Kelly (PA)	Reichert
Dent	King (IA)	Renacci
DeSantis	King (NY)	Ribble
DesJarlais	Kinzinger (IL)	Rice (SC)
Diaz-Balart	Kline	Rigell
Dold	Knight	Roby
Duffy	Labrador	Roe (TN)
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Rogers (AL)
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Rogers (KY)
Ellmers	Latta	Rohrabacher
Emmer	LoBiondo	Rokita
Farenthold	Long	Rooney (FL)

Messrs. GROTHMAN, BARLETTA, CLAWSON of Florida, BURGESS, MOOLENAAR, HUELSKAMP, and

Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema

Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vela  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker

Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

## NAYS—169

Adams  
Aguilar  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu (CA)  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle (PA)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard

Gallego  
Garamendi  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Higgins  
Himes  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu (CA)  
Lipinski  
Loebach  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Nadler

Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—11

Brat  
Carter (TX)  
Duckworth  
Forbes

Hastings  
Heck (WA)  
Hinojosa  
Johnson, Sam

Lamborn  
Nunnelee  
Perlmutter

□ 1542

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN  
STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 40

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—Ms. Adams, Ms. Graham, and Mr. Ashford.

(2) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Mr. Yarmuth (to rank immediately after Mr. Van Hollen), Mr. Norcross, and Mr. Moulton.

(3) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—Ms. Lofgren and Mr. Vargas.

(4) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mrs. Torres, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. Takai, and Mr. Gallego.

(5) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Lieu of California, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Ms. Plaskett, Mr. DeSaulnier, and Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania.

(6) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Beyer.

(7) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mrs. Lawrence.

(8) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Miss Rice of New York.

Mr. BECERRA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1545

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL  
EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO  
TERRORISTS WHO THREATEN TO  
DISRUPT THE MIDDLE EAST  
PEACE PROCESS—MESSAGE  
FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE  
UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–  
5)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared with respect

to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 2015.

The crisis with respect to grave acts of violence committed by foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that led to the declaration of a national emergency on January 23, 1995, has not been resolved. Terrorist groups continue to engage in activities that have the purpose or effect of threatening the Middle East peace process and that are hostile to United States interests in the region. Such actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process and to maintain in force the sanctions against them to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 21, 2015.

## MARCH FOR LIFE

(Mr. MULLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I believe every life is a gift. Our Nation was built on the right to life. Our Founding Fathers wrote that all men are created equal and that we are endowed by the Creator with certain undeniable rights: the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Our government was instituted to secure these rights, not take them away.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with hundreds of thousands of people from across the country who have traveled to our Nation's Capital to tell lawmakers that we must protect the innocent and that we must fight for those who cannot defend themselves. I am proud of the many young people who are in Washington, D.C., this week to defend life. You are a voice for the voiceless, and you are the future.

I am proud to join so many of my colleagues in this Chamber today to defend life and spread this message that every life is a gift.

## PAYCHECK PROGRESS

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, as the President noted in his State of the Union address last evening, we should be proud of the progress we have made since the Great Recession. But there is too much to do still on growth, especially on the issue of paycheck progress.

For most Americans, especially in the San Francisco Bay Area, here is our reality: costs all around us are

going up, and wages are staying flat. That is a right angle that is taking American families in the wrong direction.

For paycheck progress we must invest in infrastructure, reform our Tax Code so that it is fairer for all Americans, and, finally, ensure equal pay for equal work.

Mr. Speaker, instead of addressing these issues, many House Republicans are calling for giveaways to special interests, rolling back critical women's health protections, and holding Homeland Security funding hostage to win political points. Let's be real. In the nineties it was: It is the economy, stupid. You ask any American family today: It is my paycheck, stupid.

If we focus on one thing this Congress, let's make sure that it is the paycheck of working-class Americans. The American people deserve better than what is being served up. Let's work together on paycheck progress, not partisanship.

#### 42ND ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, 3,288 per day, 137 per hour, one every 26 seconds—that is how many children are denied their God-given right to life each and every day. As we mark the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we should remember each of those children and the potential each had.

Mr. Speaker, I am unabapologetically pro-life and have been a longtime supporter of efforts to protect the unborn. Because every human life is precious, we must continue to fight for those who cannot fight for themselves.

Today I stand on behalf of those children and of future children who may never have a chance. We must stand together and never forget until the battle for life is won.

#### THE GRAND JURY REFORM ACT

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Grand Jury Reform Act, which requires the appointment of a special prosecutor to conduct an investigation and present the results to a judge in an open courtroom proceeding whenever a police officer kills an individual while on duty.

After police officers killed two unarmed black men in 2014 and secret grand juries failed to indict these officers, I am honoring Dr. King's legacy by offering legislation that restores trust in our justice system while ensuring a fair process for all.

Mr. Speaker, we are the beneficiaries of Dr. King's legacy, and we must face our challenges with the same resolve as

he did. I urge my fellow colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

#### MARCH FOR LIFE

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the thousands of students from across the country who are participating in tomorrow's March for Life event. I am praying for safe travels for all the groups from my district, including St. Thomas More High School, St. Louis Parish—the parish I attended Mass at this weekend—Holy Trinity in Stonington, Illinois, and the Illinois Life Caravan as they drive through the night and travel almost 800 miles to come to Washington to stand up for what they believe in.

Mr. Speaker, I have renewed hope and faith in our Nation's young people as I see students from high school to elementary school age showing their commitment to life. I am proud to be pro-life. I believe it is my duty and part of my faith to stand up for those who cannot speak for themselves, and I will continue to do so as I serve in this great Congress.

In the words of Pope Francis:

All life has inestimable value. Even the weakest and most vulnerable, the sick, the old, the unborn, and the poor are masterpieces of God's creation, made in His own image, destined to live forever and deserving of the utmost reverence and respect.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of those who are standing here for life with us.

#### AMERICA STANDS AT THE CROSSROADS

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, last night President Obama addressed the Nation and reminded us of the crossroads at which we stand: Do we continue on the path we are on where only a select few prosper while so many families struggle? Or will we instead work to rebuild our middle class, grow our economy, and create new opportunities for success?

But here today, Mr. Speaker, listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, it is clear that the priorities of this body's majority are not in line with the majority of Americans.

The American people don't want more of the same. They want better access to education, better infrastructure, and an honest chance at the American Dream. They want a fair college loan system, and they want the relief of knowing that their retirement and their parents' retirement is safe and sound, not left to the whims of Wall Street. As President Obama made clear, they want a tax system that rewards work, not wealth.

I am proud to support many of the priorities laid out in last night's speech because they put practicality above partisan politics. Let's hope for the sake of the American people that this Congress does the same.

#### THE 42ND ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

(Mr. EMMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, on the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, I stand with my colleagues in defense of innocent human life. My wife and I were blessed with seven beautiful children, each with their own unique gifts. Since Roe v. Wade, more than 56 million unborn babies have been robbed of the chance to reach their true potential.

Our Nation's role as a defender of the rights to life and liberty erode with each innocent life that is taken. This is not a partisan issue or a judgment of others. But we must never stop defending the rights of those who cannot speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, in an era where common ground can be hard to find, I am honored to serve with the men and women dedicated to the protection of these most basic of liberties.

#### THE PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this House tomorrow will consider H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and I will support that bill because it protects most of the children in these circumstances. But I will do so with a heavy heart because it does not protect all children. Every child at 20 weeks and older deserves protection from the violence perpetrated on them in the womb by late-term abortions.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not protect all children because it gives an exception for children conceived in rape and incest. No child 20 weeks and older should be subjected to that, regardless of the circumstances in which they are conceived.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to work to try to correct that injustice as well, and I hope efforts are afoot to make this bill perfect in the sense that it would protect every single child 20 weeks and older because none of them deserve less.

#### MARCH FOR LIFE

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and respect of the thousands of people who will come to our

city to rally to give support to the life of the unborn. Twenty-five years ago while in London I saw a video that depicted the life, as they described it, of the baby. It wasn't anything less than a baby.

Mr. Speaker, I am a father, and I am a grandfather. I have got nine grandchildren. Every life is precious. Who is to know, Mr. Speaker, that that unborn baby might be the curer for cancer or might be the curer for Alzheimer's? Only God knows.

I thank the leadership for bringing forth this legislation tomorrow. I respect them for doing it. We need to rally in support to show our commitment to the life of the unborn.

#### —

#### HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### —

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of our Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### —

#### REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO SERVE AS THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to section 4(d) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following individuals to serve as the Governing Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics:

Nominated by the Speaker with the concurrence of the Minority Leader:

Mr. Porter J. Goss, Florida, Chairman

Mr. James M. Eagan, III, Colorado

Ms. Allison R. Hayward, Virginia

Ms. Judy Biggert, Illinois, alternate

Nominated by the Minority Leader with the concurrence of the Speaker:

Mr. David Skaggs, Colorado, Co-Chairman

Brigadier General (retired) Belinda Pinckney, Virginia

Ms. Karan English, Arizona

Mr. Mike Barnes, Maryland, alternate

□ 1600

#### PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the distinguished gentlelady from Missouri, ANN WAGNER.

Ms. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate and thank the gentleman for yielding and for hosting this very important Special Order today and for his lifetime of service in protecting the rights of the unborn, those who have no voice.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the sanctity of life. Sadly, tomorrow is the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, and hundreds of thousands of people, including pro-life advocates from my own hometown of St. Louis, Missouri, will gather in our Nation's capital in honor of the over 56 million precious angels we have lost since that infamous Supreme Court decision, not to mention the millions of women who have been adversely affected in the aftermath of their abortion, both physically and emotionally.

I first participated in the March for Life 25 years ago this week, in 1990. I was 28 years old with a real bad hairdo, and I was 12 weeks pregnant with my son Stephen. At that point, at 12 weeks in my pregnancy, Stephen was able to suck his thumb. A few weeks later, at 15 weeks, he could make facial expressions and he had taste buds. By 17 weeks, Stephen began to kick. By week 18, his ears had developed and he could hear. By week 20, not only was Stephen able to recognize my voice as his mother, but he was capable of feeling pain.

While killing an unborn child is unconscionable at anytime, it is especially abhorrent at the 20-week mark when a child is able to feel the pain of an abortion.

Mr. Speaker, the theme of this year's march is "Every Life is a Gift," and I truly believe that life at all stages, from conception to natural death, is, indeed, a gift. I am for the life of the baby. I am also for the life of the mother and oftentimes the victim.

I will continue to work and to pray for the day when abortion is not only illegal, but abortion is unthinkable.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank Ms. Wagner for her very eloquent statement and for her long service on behalf of the unborn and equally for their mothers as well.

I yield to TIM WALBERG.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for putting this Special Order together on the 42nd anniversary of an infamous decision, Roe v. Wade. Mr. Speaker, where I believe the Supreme Court stepped out of their role and unconstitutionally set up the course that has gone on to this day, the murder of in-

nocents and, ultimately, murder of innocence of our country as well that in its inception was established on a principle that was well known, well understood, and put into our Declaration of Independence that said:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, among them the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It all begins with life. I will never forget 8 years ago as I stood in a maternity ward at Northwestern University Hospital and waited for word from the room where my daughter-in-law was giving birth to our first two grandchildren, twins John Timothy and Micah Todd.

Micah Todd is now 8 years old, happy, healthy, moving forward. John Timothy we look forward to seeing him again some day in heaven. For 8 days he lived on this Earth. He fought after being born with his twin brother at 26 weeks. I watched them as they fought for life. I watched them at less than 12 inches long, one pound, 12 ounces, fighting for life, understanding in their own way that this is what they were supposed to do. They were capable of pain. They were capable of doing what nature's God had enabled them to do.

That changed my life more than ever before, though back in 1982 I ran for the State house on the issue of life itself. That is what brought me out of the pulpit as a pastor and brought me into the arena to try to promote life and go away from that terrible decision that the Supreme Court put upon us.

Now I think 42 years later we have seen gains in this country, as we will see millennials come out of Metro tubes tomorrow, as we will see young people standing in front of us speaking for life, declaring their desire to see abortion ended, and I am hopeful that in our day we will see that take place not because of religion, not even because of politics, but because of people understanding the sanctity of life, understood by the prophet Jeremiah when he said after the words of God himself:

Before I was formed in my mother's womb, you knew me and declared the days of my life.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New Jersey, all of my colleagues who will stand in defense of life, I say thank you. Let's not give up, because we are on the right side.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana, MARLIN STUTZMAN.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his tireless work on this, such an important issue for our day and age.

Mr. Speaker, on this 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we must remember the innocent lives who were never given a chance to live the American Dream. Since 1973, tens of millions of innocent unborn children have been denied an opportunity to grow and to be successful.

In America, we are always espousing the belief that anything is possible,

that anyone can achieve their dreams if they set their minds to it, and yet it is here in this country where we deny those dreams to so many.

Mr. Speaker, I was born in 1976, and I am so thankful that my mother, at the age of 17, chose life and gave me the gift of life, because my Federal Government at the time 3 years earlier said it was okay for her to end it if she so chose.

Most of us have very strong feelings about the value of life. We must continue to seek opportunities to promote a culture of life that protects the innocent.

Tomorrow, tens of thousands of people from all across the country will descend on The National Mall to champion the belief that every life is a gift, and Congress will have an opportunity to act and show that we are listening through the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, a bill that I urge my colleagues to support.

We may meet some obstacles, but the pro-life movement will not be shaken. We will continue to fight to protect the unborn. We will continue to fight and provide a voice for those who do not have one. We will continue to fight because we believe that America should be a place where everyone is protected by law and welcomed to life. This is our goal, and I pray that together we will achieve it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank my friend for his, again, very fine statement and for his leadership as well.

I yield to CHRIS STEWART from Utah.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in thanking my friend Mr. SMITH for giving us this opportunity to address such an important and a deeply personal issue.

I am the proud father of six children, and nothing in the world means more to me. My life changed forever the first time I held my first son. I look at my sons and daughters, and I am humbled by the responsibility it is to be their parent, and I am touched always by the power and the blessing of life.

Now I am a grandfather, and that fact alone makes my life very good. This week we commemorate the anniversary of one of the most significant Supreme Court cases in the history of the United States, of course, *Roe v. Wade*.

We also welcome thousands of pro-life activists who came to our Nation's Capital to participate in the March for Life. Think about that title for a moment, the March for Life. It is extremely important as Members of Congress to stand up for those who do not have a voice to stand up for themselves, our precious unborn children.

Tomorrow the House will vote on H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which protects the lives of unborn by banning abortions at or after 20 weeks of pregnancy. With medical evidence that an unborn child is capable of experiencing pain by at least 20 weeks, if not earlier, I will sup-

port this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well. Think of what we would be saying if we were to reject this bill.

Now, I understand that there are exceptions, and I recognize the woman's health is just as important as her child. Thus, we made reasonable medical judgment exceptions, which would be made in the case of rape, incest, or an endangerment of the mother's life.

As I conclude, I would like to reiterate my opening remarks. Each life is sacred. Each life has a right to protection. I urge my colleagues to help to defend the innocent lives of America's unborn children and represent those who cannot represent themselves.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. STEWART, thank you very much for your statement and your leadership as well.

I now yield to Mr. YOHO, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my dear colleague, Mr. SMITH, for holding this important pro-life Special Order that gives a life to the unborn.

I stand here today in defense of the thousands of unborn children whose lives were ended through no fault of their own. These children are precious gifts and cannot defend themselves. They do not have the luxury to debate whether or not society should recognize them as living beings.

As a Christian and the proud father also of three children, I strongly believe in the sanctity of life and that it begins at conception. My heart aches for the thousands of unborn children who will never have that chance to experience the wonder of life.

Life is truly a miracle granted through the grace of nature's God, and I am here today to say every life is a gift and every life does matter.

It has been 42 years since the Supreme Court made their ruling in *Roe v. Wade*. Since that ruling, an estimated—and I want to repeat this, an estimated—55 million lives have been lost. That is more than the total population of the northeast States. That is more than the population of the State of California.

Future generations will look back and judge us. They will judge us on our failure to protect the most innocent among us. They will judge us for allowing infanticide, human genocide of our next generation yet to come.

This week, the defenders of life in the thousands have and will come to Washington, D.C., to support the sanctity of life. This has grown into the largest pro-life event in the world. I want them to know we will keep fighting to defend the silent, unborn child.

How can we as a nation—how can we as a nation—have laws that protect the embryo of a sea turtle or bald eagle but yet refuse to protect the same of our own species? Shouldn't the lives of the unborn children matter as much as these in the eyes of the law?

These lives, these gifts, these human beings deserve to be protected and defended.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I now yield to DOUG LAMALFA from California.

□ 1615

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for leading this Special Order today, and also for the comments started out by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), very heartfelt, that reflect the importance of this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the sanctity of human life and to recognize those who will be in Washington, D.C., tomorrow for the March for Life. I am pleased to join my colleagues and individuals who have traveled from near and far to be in solidarity to protect the rights of the unborn. I applaud those marchers who come here year after year despite snow, rainy conditions, and cold conditions to stand up for such a vital cause. It is their efforts and determination which gives substance and meaning to this year's theme, "Every Life is a Gift"—and to march for the truth.

As a parent, I wish all parents would understand what the gift is that the Lord has bestowed with one of these young lives upon you. That is part of our mission, to help them understand, to educate. That is part of the mission of the March for Life, to appreciate that these are gifts, even through the hard times. We have struggles in all matters of our lives, and that is an important one we have to get through as well. To understand these blessings that these lives are.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you to convey to these marchers that their voice will be heard and will continue to be heard as we fight for the dignity of human life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for his incisive comments and for welcoming the marchers tomorrow, which will be a great celebration of life but also a restatement of the determination we have in defending life.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. What a privilege it is to be here with the gentleman from New Jersey, who has been fighting this fight for a very long time. I remember back to my college days in the 1980s seeing you standing for life.

I rise today to commemorate the 2015 March for Life, appropriately themed "Every Life is a Gift." Life begins at conception and must be defended at every stage. Whether for the unborn, the disabled, the elderly, we must promote a culture of life. This can and must be done through our public policy that is made here in Washington, D.C., just as it is being done throughout the country in our communities.

Across the country there are many places, thousands of pro-life pregnancy centers, places like Choices Pregnancy Services in western Pennsylvania,

which does important work helping families say “yes” to life by offering free medical and counseling services and helping women in need.

As we prepare to march tomorrow on the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, a decision that the late Justice Byron White described as an exercise in raw judicial power, I urge my colleagues to join me in committing to defend the sanctity of life. I also ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank Mr. ROTHFUS for his statement today. He has been a true rising star and a leader in defending the sanctity of life.

I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a physician who has delivered over 5,000 babies.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Before I start, I want to say a few things about my good friend CHRIS SMITH. Of the 435 of us who serve here in the House of Representatives, no one in this body has been a stronger voice for life than CHRIS. CHRIS, thank you. Hopefully one day we will see this egregious law overturned. Your perseverance over now four decades is exemplary. Thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, as an OB-GYN, I have personally delivered over 5,000 babies, and I strongly support the sanctity of life. Using technology like the 3-D ultrasound has given us a window into the womb that shows the unborn child as a living, breathing, feeling human being. I have looked through that window with my own eyes literally thousands of times, and I have seen human development occur from the earliest stages of conception. When you see a heartbeat at 26 days post-conception, already dreams are being developed by that mother and father about what this baby will be in their lifetime. I have been fortunate enough to experience that three times, and it is a wonderful feeling to know that this little person is going to be your child and grow up to be who knows what. All of the way through birth we see this, which strengthens my conviction in the right to life.

Life is a precious miracle from God that begins at conception. It is our responsibility and privilege as legislators to protect those who do not have a voice. I will always fight for life because it is my conviction that we are all unique creations of a God who knows us and loves us before we are born.

Tonight we mark one of the most tragic, misguided Supreme Court cases in our Nation's history: *Roe v. Wade*. Since 1973, more than 50 million babies, as has been stated here numerous times, have been denied the most basic right in this country, protected by our Constitution, which is the right to life. We must make our laws consistent with our science now and restore full legal protections to all those who are waiting to be born. If government has any legitimate function at all, it is to

protect those, the most innocent among us.

For over 30 years Congress has prevented taxpayer-funded abortions. Unfortunately, this door has been reopened with the passage of *ObamaCare*, the largest expansion since the pivotal *Roe v. Wade* decision was made 42 years ago. Members who stand here before you today pledge themselves to protect those without a voice, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure this promise is kept. It is only by making good on this oath that we can expect to restore the trust that the American people have in their own government, and in doing so, ensure that the door to taxpayer-funded abortions remains closed.

Let me just tell a brief story I was telling Congressman SMITH before we came onto the House floor. Over 25 years ago, my partner delivered a baby, and I will just say “Smith” for privacy purposes. Baby Smith weighed about 1 pound 6 ounces over 25 years ago. Well, the chances of that baby surviving were minimal. Baby Smith got down to less than one pound. I went by the intensive care nursery and saw this tiny baby that I thought would never make it. Well, Baby Smith did make it, and I was on a trip to Walmart with my kids one day, and there was this youngster there with a pair of glasses on, just like his doctor had. He was 2 years old, and he was doing like any other 2 year old—he was knocking everything off the shelf at Walmart. Wouldn't it have been a shame—and we are aborting babies much larger than Baby Smith—and Baby Smith is alive and well today, thriving in our country and being a productive citizen in this country.

As a father and a grandfather, I am privileged to be here on the House floor tonight with other legislators fighting for the rights of the unborn.

CHRIS, thank you, and I thank my colleagues. God bless each and every one of you.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much for your kind statement, and also for your leadership both as a physician, a obstetrician, and also as a lawmaker. It has made a huge difference. I want to say that publicly. You provide insight and guidance that all of us benefit from.

I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you, Congressman. I know we probably sound like a broken record—and for the marchers coming in tomorrow, that is something that they used before there were CDs. Isn't that great—we have all of these marchers coming in who don't even know what a record is because they are so young. In the battle for life, we are winning with this generation. They understand the reality of when life begins. I am so thankful for that, and I am so thankful for CHRIS SMITH's leadership.

Like one of my earlier colleagues, I remember being on the other side of

the rally watching the Congressman and saying: Gosh darnit, I wish I could be like him. What can I do?

That is what I would like to talk about tonight: What can we do to make a difference? Of course, as we will see tomorrow, a tremendous level of political involvement with tens, perhaps hundreds of thousands of folks showing up here from all over the country. Generally you have people from Kansas to lead the march, and it is great to see some kids from Benedictine College and throughout my district as well getting involved, making a difference, both here in Washington and in their State capital, coming here for the March for Life, which we hashtagged “Why We March.”

What else can we do? Very quickly, we can help and assist women and families in crisis pregnancies. There are hundreds and hundreds of facilities across the country that offer free help and free care, outreach for those in very difficult situations. We can do that.

The second thing we can do is encourage families, current families, encourage marriage. Marriage is a founding block of our society, of our civilization. The more we can encourage marriage, the more we can encourage families and the more we can help our unborn.

We can also consider adoption. For those who are listening today who are wondering, maybe that should be for me—sometimes it might be one spouse. Sometimes it might be another. I was with a couple of friends this weekend just talking about that, saying, think about it, pray about it, consider it, because there are literally tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of young folks who are looking for homes. So please consider that.

And lastly, I ask, please pray for the unborn, please pray for birth families, and please pray for those who are considering adoption.

Lastly, I want to briefly thank the four birth families who blessed our family with children. Some of them I know, some of them I do not. Two of them are in foreign countries and two of those families are here in this country. But that is a tough decision. I am so thankful for the men and women of this country that chose life and offered up their children for adoption.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much for sharing that very personal story, which is very touching.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I appreciate my friend from New Jersey yielding me this time, and I rise today to join my colleagues and thousands of Americans who will be marching on Washington, D.C., tomorrow because every life truly is a gift, which is this year's Right to Life march theme. It has been talked about, the millions of young lives that have been tragically cut short.



But I, like my colleague and our friend from Kansas, who was just talking about his personal experience with adoption, I come from a place in western Michigan that has really embraced the notion of adoption. We have a number of friends and neighbors who have done both domestic and international adoption. In fact, one family is now on their third adoption from Africa, and this time they are coming home with a brother and sister for four kids, adding to their own natural five that they have. And I must add that, a little jokingly, we are not Catholic typically in western Michigan, we are just passionate Protestants. We are wanting to share that gift of life and opportunity for those children who have that potential that their parents see and go through a difficult decision to put them up, and whether it is domestically or internationally, we are so pleased that they have done that.

It is also why, because life being so precious, why my wife, Natalie, and I have been active through our church and Michigan Right to Life, and my wife particularly through the Lakeshore Pregnancy Center, a crisis pregnancy center that she has been on the board of for a number of years that is helping young men and women make those difficult choices in those difficult life circumstances.

I understand, and I know my colleagues know this as well. This is very difficult. It is very emotional. These are issues that have affected so many of us. As we deal with difficult circumstances where these pregnancies have arisen, whether it is through rape or through mistakes that have been made to have these unplanned pregnancies, I think we need to show that love and that mercy that we have been shown at various times in our life.

I do want to encourage my colleagues in the House, though, to take a close look at a loophole, an issue that I became aware of a couple of years ago. Over the previous two Congresses, I introduced something called the Homeland Security Respect For Life Act and worked with my friend and Appropriations member, Representative ADERHOLT, to attach language to the annual Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill.

This commonsense bill simply prevents hardworking taxpayer dollars from paying for abortions through the DHS programs that currently would fund abortions for detainees who lack lawful status here in the United States. In fact, this bill codifies pro-life language that is already found in the ICE, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, manual on detention standards. But since this manual lacks a basis in law and the weight of law, it can be changed at any time by unelected bureaucrats.

Well, I think it is time for us to put the DHS in line with other departments of the government and codify this and make sure that this is crystal clear. Our current policy prohibits Fed-

eral taxpayer funding for abortions for law-abiding citizens on Medicaid, as well as citizens who are in Federal prison, why not the DHS and why not in these detention areas? It only makes sense to apply those same life-affirming standards to immigration detainees as well.

□ 1630

This is an easy fix, Mr. Chairman, and I am hopeful that this year the Senate and the President will agree to our bill language and follow the precedent as consistent with current administration policy in the other Federal agencies. I, too, want to say thank you for your leadership in this area and appreciate the opportunity to spend some time on the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Mr. HUIZENGA. I want to thank you, BILL, for your leadership on pro-life issues in general, but especially for your legislation that deals with the detainees issue because that could quickly emerge as a trouble spot if we are paying for abortions of people who make it across the border. That would be unconscionable to think that we would be enabling the killing of those precious children, so thank you.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Thank you very much. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and also, I want to extend my thanks for all your many, many years of work and leadership to protect the life and lives of the unborn. We really appreciate everything you have done, and I know, across the country, it is appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise today to voice my support for the right to life of unborn children. During my time in the Ohio General Assembly and, now, as a Member of Congress, I have always been a strong supporter of pro-life legislation. I firmly believe we must be vigilant in protecting the sanctity of human life.

As previously mentioned by other Members, it is heartbreaking to know that, since 1973, there have been more than 55 million abortions in the United States. Fortunately, a report released in February 2014 found abortion rates and ratios are continuing to decline in the United States and the rate of abortion has dropped to its lowest since its legalization; however, there is still more work to be done. That is why I continually support legislation to protect the unborn.

Tomorrow, tens of thousands of our fellow citizens will be in Washington to participate in the March for Life, and I salute them for their steadfastness in our cause for life. They will be here to let their voices be heard.

I can speak that, in our church, I know that we sponsor a couple of buses that will be coming down from Bowling Green State University, my alma mater. There will be high schoolers from across my district that will be here, and we salute them, again, for

making sure that they are here to have their voices heard.

I also want to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to those who have tirelessly worked for years to defend the right to life; and, again, I thank the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Mr. LATTA.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. SMITH, for yielding, and thank you also for calling this Special Order, particularly as Congress, tomorrow, will take up an important issue relating to the unborn.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, of all the responsibilities given to Congress under our Constitution, none is more important than to protect and preserve life.

Throughout the history of governments, through the entire course of the world as we know it, governments have had the power to decide who dies and who lives. Our Founding Fathers established the United States to ensure the protection of first life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all of our citizens.

As the people's Congress, we pass laws that define life. We pass laws that define life for all Americans, including the unborn. No matter that comes before this Congress or our society is more important than the matter of protecting the lives of our citizens; and, my colleagues, no citizen is more vulnerable or helpless than the unborn.

Our Nation, in respect for life and the unborn, must not waver. Protecting human life at every opportunity must be our only option and certainly our moral responsibility.

As thousands of pro-life Americans express their support for the unborn at our Nation's Capital this week, I welcome them, and I also hope and pray that their voice is heard.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, Chairman MICA.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JOE PITTS, and just before I do, I note that Mr. PITTS not only chairs the Subcommittee on Health for the Energy and Commerce Committee, but prior to coming to Washington, he was one of the prime authors of a sweeping pro-life law in Pennsylvania that has saved countless lives.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank CHRIS SMITH for his leadership over the years. He is one of the people, along with Henry Hyde, that I admired from afar, and when I was elected 18 years ago, I told him I want to come and hold up his arms in this fight for life. He has been a real champion and just a terrific leader here in the Congress. I want to thank him for that.

I heard in a congressional life forum a few years ago a lady by the name of Frederica Mathewes-Green—she was president of the Feminists for Life—and she said something I will never forget. She said:

Abortion is the most violent form of death known to mankind. It is death by dismemberment, decapitation, and poisoning.

She said:

Abortion breaks a mother's heart.

She said:

There are always two victims in an abortion. One is the baby, and one is the mother; one is dead, one is wounded.

I never forgot those statements of this great feminist leader. I think her focus is right. We need to keep that focus where it is, where she had it: on the mother, on the baby.

We are talking here about babies who are in their 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th month of pregnancy. For the first 5 months, a woman could have an abortion, but after that, it bans abortion, and I want to say this: I was first elected in 1972, inaugurated 3 weeks before *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, so I have been involved in these battles for the whole time.

This is the first time in my memory that our leadership has moved substantive legislation on the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade* on the day of the march. They should be applauded for that. This is significant.

In 2 years, if things go the way we hope, with a new Republican President and a House and a Senate, 2 years from tomorrow, we could very well see this legislation signed into law. That is how important this is. It moves the bar back on *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, those two infamous decisions that have resulted in 55 million unborn children and women being affected by abortion.

As CHRIS said, I was involved in authoring the Pennsylvania Abortion Control Act, but I also was involved in the Medicaid funding cutoff bill that passed in Pennsylvania—I think that was about 1978—and we had a reporting requirement in that bill, so that the abortions that were due to rape and incest had to be reported to the appropriate law enforcement or social service agencies.

The year before our bill was passed into law, there were some 740 abortions, Medicaid-funded abortions, due to so-called rape. The year after our bill was signed into law, there were 38. This shows the importance of that provision into law of reporting to the appropriate authorities.

If you remove that provision from the law—and some people want to do that—that would create a loophole for late-term abortions. As I said, for the first 5 months, a woman could have an abortion, but in the later term, they could not without the appropriate reporting to appropriate authorities. It would, I think, be a mistake, as some would like to do, to remove those requirements.

I just might conclude by saying that we are one of only seven countries that allow abortion at any point of pregnancy. Some countries are appalled that the United States would permit these late-term abortions. We had a famous case in Pennsylvania, the Kermit Gosnell clinic, which was outrageous when people find out what happened in those late-term abortions.

Scientific studies tell us that children feel pain in the womb. These are

the children at this age who smile in the womb, who suck their thumb, who hiccup, who have dream patterns on the brainwaves, who react to light if it is intrauterine or a pinprick.

These are very tiny but knowing, learning individuals. They have no one to speak for them. They are voiceless, so we have an obligation to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves, who can't run away, who face this horrific type of death, and the mothers who carry them.

I would urge Members, just like as shown in the public polls, the majority of Americans support the legislation. I would like to thank the leadership for moving the legislation and like to say that we are admonished in the scriptures that if we see someone drawn to death and we do not speak up, we do nothing, that we will be held responsible because, really, nothing is doing something, silence is consent.

With the other pro-life people, Members, and our great champion, I urge the Members to support this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Mr. PITTS. Again, I want to thank you for your leadership both at the State and, now, Federal level, especially as chairman of the committee that deals with health. Thank you so much.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), who has also been an outspoken champion of the right to life.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 42nd anniversary of the infamous *Roe v. Wade* Supreme Court decision, which legalized elective abortion in the U.S.

Elective abortion is an abhorrent practice that tragically remains a common medical procedure performed in the U.S. Every year, over 1 million abortions are performed here.

Since 1973, when *Roe v. Wade* was decided, 57 million babies have been lost to abortion—57 million, Mr. Speaker. To put this in perspective, according to the last census numbers, 57 million is about 18 percent of the U.S. population. This staggering loss of children's lives is unconscionable.

My wife, Jeanie, and I have been blessed with five children and two grandchildren, with one more on the way. I firmly believe that every life is a precious gift from God, and I am wholly committed to protecting the sanctity of life.

One critically important step towards protecting life is the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act that we will be voting on tomorrow. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill that will prohibit anyone from performing an abortion on an unborn child that is 20 weeks or older.

Medical research has shown that at least by the 20th week of a pregnancy, unborn babies can feel pain. Polls have consistently shown that a majority of Americans support banning abortions after 20 weeks. Abortions after the 20th

week are painful, violent, and harmful, even to the mothers. It is time to end this horrible procedure.

This week, we will continue to mourn the lives cut short in the inhuman wake of *Roe v. Wade*. We pray for God's continued comfort, grace, and mercy to those touched by abortion.

Every life has value, and we have a duty to protect the lives of those who are the most innocent among us. I will continue to be among those fighting to do just that.

□ 1645

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, Doug.

I would like to now close, and I want to thank my distinguished colleagues for their eloquent statements in defense of life.

Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago tomorrow marks the U.S. Supreme Court's infamous, reckless, and inhumane abandonment of women and babies to the abortionists—42 years of victims, dead babies, wounded women, shattered families; 42 years of government-sanctioned violence against women and children. Since 1973, more than 56 million—maybe 57 million—children have been killed by abortion—a staggering loss of children's lives, a death toll that equates to the entire population of England.

The passage of time has not changed the fact that abortion is a serious, lethal violation of fundamental human rights. Rather than gull our consciences to the unmitigated violence of abortion, however, the passage of time has only enabled us to see better and to understand better the innate cruelty of abortion and its horrific legacy—victims—while making us more determined than ever to protect the weakest and most vulnerable.

In his inaugural speech, President Obama said in pertinent part:

Together, we resolve that a great nation must care for the vulnerable, that all are created equal, and our journey is not complete until all our children are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm.

Yes, Mr. President. We must care for the vulnerable, but that also includes unborn children and their mothers. No one gets left out or left behind. All people are created equal, and our journey is not complete until all of our children, including the child in the womb, are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm.

Last night, right here in this Chamber, the President said to tell every child in every neighborhood, "Your life matters." Again, Mr. Speaker, the President is leaving out a whole class of human beings, who because of the fact they are in utero—the fact that they are yet to be born—they are construed to be excluded from humanity and, therefore, from their basic human rights. It is unconscionable, Mr. Speaker. It is unconscionable.

Let me also say, in talking about victims, a couple of years ago, I met a woman named Linda Shrewsbury—an

academic, an African American, with a degree from Harvard, who had an abortion. She said:

The lies that brought me to that day and to its sorrowful aftermath are crystal clear in my mind—falsehoods and deceptions that concealed the truth about abortion. Lies planted in my thinking by clever marketing and media campaigns and endless repetition led to a tragic, irreversible decision—the death of my first child.

Ms. Shrewsbury went on to say:

I really didn't understand back then. At age 20, I had no inkling of the mental and emotional darkness I was about to enter. I couldn't have grasped the immense psychological toll it would take for years into the future—unrelenting tears, guilt, shame, and depression. After spending many years in denial, I did eventually find healing.

Linda goes on to say:

When I understood and rejected distortions about fetal development, doublespeak about choice, rights, and planned and wanted children, I understood the reality and victimhood of my aborted child.

She went on and concluded:

I understood the absence of moral basis for choosing to disfigure an innocent human being of life. When I embraced the truth, the truth set me free, and I, finally, gained inner peace.

Some of my colleagues have mentioned the historic vote that we will take tomorrow on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, as you know, is a modest but necessary attempt to at least protect babies who are 20 weeks old and who are pain capable from having to suffer and die from abortion.

I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but I, like, I think, most people, avoid pain at almost all costs. When I have surgeries—when anyone has surgeries—I am put locally or generally under anesthesia so that I do not have to feel the pain. The unborn child, when he or she is getting an intervention to help cure a disability or to deal with disease or illness, gets anesthesia because we now know beyond any reasonable doubt that unborn children who are at least at 20-weeks' gestation feel that pain.

When the abortionist commits a D&E abortion or one of the other abortions—D&E is literally a way of dismembering the child—they feel this pain—"they" being the children—and it is excruciating. Children, including children with disabilities, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

I would point out to my colleagues the expert testimony of Dr. Anthony Levatino's before the House Judiciary Committee. He is a former abortionist who has performed hundreds of dismemberment abortions. He described D&E. He said:

The baby can be in any position inside the uterus. Just reach in with a Sopher clamp, and grasp whatever you can.

The former abortionist went on to say:

Pull really hard, and out pops an arm. Reach in again and again, and tear out the spine, intestines, heart, and lungs.

Pull out a severed arm. Tear out the spine, intestines, heart, and lungs. This

is child abuse, Mr. Speaker. Not only is this assault on a child inhumane, it is extremely painful as the child experiences that dismemberment. Again, I say that children, including children with disabilities, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

Again, tomorrow is the March for Life, and there will be tens of thousands of people there who are speaking out for the unborn and equally for their mothers. There will be numbers of women there from the Silent No More Awareness Campaign—all women who have had abortions and who now speak out eloquently and with great compassion to say to women who are post-abortive that there is hope, that there is reconciliation. Face the truth, and that is the beginning to that reconciliation.

We will be there tomorrow, praying, working, of course—even fasting—for that day when every life is cherished as a gift, every life loved despite one's disability, race, sex, color, religion, or condition of dependency, when every life is welcomed no matter the inconvenience.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### CONTRASTING VIEWS OF GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GROTHMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House and to address the country this afternoon and to do so with colleagues of mine from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) to draw a contrast between the view of government represented by our side of the aisle and of that which we heard last night from our President, a President who seemingly ignored the will of the people as expressed by the ballot box in November and who, instead, doubled down on an agenda that we believe on our side of the aisle is the wrong view of government and the wrong direction for our Nation. So I rise with my colleagues today to talk about just a few of the very substantive points and to do so very constructively and to present why we have a different view of government and why we think that is important.

I would start by suggesting this. If we think about what the President said last night, in his words, the President declared from the rostrum that no challenge poses a greater threat to future generations than climate change. Now, I understand the sympathetic position on climate change. I am from a coastal State, and, frankly, I am a member of the Republican Party who believes that, indeed, the climate is changing, but I do not believe that the greatest challenge facing our future generations is that of climate change.

In fact, you can harken back to the words of Thomas Jefferson. He had a

very different opinion than our President had last night. He said that public debt is the greatest of dangers for our Nation to fear. I would suggest that Jefferson was right, that the greatest threat to our future generations is actually economic security and domestic security. I would like to speak for just a couple of moments about that and allow my colleagues to talk about other portions of the President's remarks.

Let's first talk about the long-term threat to our economic security—our national debt—a topic that was completely ignored in the President's address to the Nation last night.

Understand the significance of where we sit historically when it comes to the national debt. When this President took office, our national debt was just over \$10 trillion, meaning it had taken 220 years for our Republic—220 years—to accumulate just over \$10 trillion in debt, a number already far too high. In the 8 years of this administration, an additional \$10 trillion will be added under this President's watch. When he leaves his office, our debt will be over \$20 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, that is a threat to our national security. The greatest threat, perhaps, to our national security, arguably, could be unwatched, out-of-control spending and debt that ultimately collapses our economic system and ensures that we are no longer the world's greatest superpower. In fact, George Washington, himself, admonished that we have a moral obligation to pay off our debts during the life of the majority, during our lifetimes.

Rather than hearing from a President who doubled down on a very progressive agenda and who suggested with the rare audacity, as he did, that our Nation is fine in that conflicts and wars are over, in that our economy has returned, in that we have faster job growth than European nations—and yet the President suggested last night that he wants to grow our government in the very same manner that these European nations have today—and rather than tell us how to grow a government we already can't afford, I would ask the President to present a plan to pay for the government we already have.

The greatest threat to future generations is not climate change. It is our economic security, and it is also our homeland security. Many on this side of the aisle have grave reservations about the President's current plan to combat the war against ISIS, or ISIL—against radical extremists-terrorists who intend to bring harm to the United States. That is a threat. That is a real threat.

The President called for something last night that I strongly agree with. I think this body should have a robust debate about an authorization to use military force. We owe it to the American people, who sent us here, to represent them on this very critical issue

of what is our national policy to protect our homeland, to protect American lives.

In fact, what is the current plan to arm Syrian rebels, and what is the likelihood that that will actually be successful when we have seen a lack of success in areas like Iraq?

Despite the declarations of last night, I would challenge that we are not as safe as, perhaps, the President suggested. From the Middle East, to Africa, to Paris, to Yemen, to our very own border, what is that plan?

House Republicans passed a border security bill that reflected the will of the people last July, yet we heard nothing last night—not a single comment—about how to secure our border. It is a sharp contrast. We heard about negotiating with Iran. We heard about releasing prisoners from GTMO. We heard nothing about securing our borders and securing our homeland, so we have taken this time today to present a constructive contrast between the President's view of government and our view of government and what we believe are the right priorities of our government.

I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues today, and I would yield now to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my good friend and colleague from Florida, and thank you to my good friend and colleague from Alabama for joining us, Mr. BYRNE.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great opportunity to talk about what we heard in this Chamber, just slightly less than 24 hours ago, from this President, who is from my home State of Illinois. We heard a lot of ideas and a lot of talk and a lot of promises, but if it is anything like the State of the Union Addresses that I have had an opportunity to sit on in this Chamber over the last 2 years, we are not going to see a lot of action.

There was a lot of talk about the economy. The economy is getting better. Frankly, it can't have gotten much worse when you compare it to a few years ago. Of course, it is going to get better, but the reality is there are still 8.7 million Americans who are out of work, and 7 million Americans are in part-time jobs but are looking for full-time jobs.

□ 1700

The President's solution to many of the issues that were brought up was to tax more American families—to tax American families who have been saving for their children's college education to pay for a grandiose idea he has yet to give us the details on.

The President also talked about helping our heroes: our veterans. This one is personal to me because just a few weeks ago, the day we got sworn in for the 114th Congress, Mr. Speaker, we were able to unanimously pass a bill called the Hire More Heroes Act, which I sponsored. This wasn't an idea that

came from Washington. It was an idea that came from Illinois. Brad Lavite, the superintendent of the Madison County, Illinois, Veterans Assistance Commission, came to me during the last Congress and said, Why is it that veterans who are getting their health care through TRICARE and through the Department of Defense count towards the ObamaCare 50-employee limit in the employer mandate?

I came here, took his idea, and garnered hundreds of cosponsors to put this on the floor of the House. It passed in the last Congress, but it got held up in the Senate. It passed unanimously in this Congress on day one, and that bill should go through the Senate and get to the President's desk. If he wants to help veterans get jobs, I hope the President signs that immediately when it hits his desk, hopefully, in no more than a few weeks.

These are the types of solutions that are bipartisan solutions that the President told us he wanted to put forth, but he talked to us in a manner that I didn't think was bipartisan at all. Most of his speech talked about what he was going to do. I would have rather heard the President talk about what we are going to do together because, frankly, that is what my constituents in Illinois want us to do. They want us to come here and govern together.

That is why I am so glad to be here and be a part of this Special Order with my good friend, Mr. JOLLY. Hopefully, we can begin a good banter about discussing what our thoughts are on where America needs to go to move forward and work with this President but do it in a way that is a lot less confrontational than what we heard last night.

Mr. JOLLY. With that, I yield to a real leader in this institution, a colleague of ours from the great State of Alabama, Mr. BRADLEY BYRNE.

Mr. BYRNE. I thank the gentlemen from Florida and Illinois. Those were eloquent words spoken from the heart, because I know both of these gentlemen mean everything they just said.

Last night was an interesting moment for me. One of the President's big plays is this proposal regarding community colleges.

Let me tell you a little bit about myself. I am the first person in my family to go to college. Both of my parents grew up during the Depression. There wasn't any money for college, but I was privileged to go to college. During the time that I went, my parents were not doing well financially. Like very many other people, I was a financial aid student.

We didn't have Pell grants back then. You got Federal student loans and maybe a Federal student work-study job. Lots and lots of people in my generation did that. I don't ever complain about that because that is the best money I ever borrowed and the best work I ever did because it gave me the opportunity to do what I have done in life. But it also taught me how impor-

tant it is to give people an opportunity for a real education so that they can move up in their lives.

This May, the last of my four children will finish college. We have had somebody in college in my family since 2003. I have been writing those tuition checks, fees, et cetera. So I look at this also from the point of view of someone who has had to be there writing those checks, sending their young people to college. But I am also the former chancellor of post-secondary education for the State of Alabama. It was my job to be the CEO of Alabama's 2-year college system, the community colleges for the State of Alabama. And so I bring a certain level of experience and expertise to this issue that may be a little different from others in this body.

When the President first proposed this, his office just gave us a heads up. It didn't check and say, Do you think this is a good idea? Given your background, do you think this is something we can do? He said, This is what we're going to do.

Our first question we asked was, How much will it cost? The initial answer we got from the White House was, We don't know how much it's going to cost. Now that should cause us all to ask a question about how serious this proposal is when, in the very first instance that they decide that they are going to propose it, they can't even tell us how much it costs. Even after they decided how much they think it is going to cost—\$60 billion—they couldn't tell us how they were going to pay for it.

So it led me to ask this question: Is this a serious idea? Because, you see, over a third of our community college students in America are already on Federal Pell grants, which cover all—or virtually all—of their tuition and fee costs when they go to community college. And for the people that don't have the eligibility to get Pell grants, there are a combination of other things that they can get.

My experience as somebody who ran a community college system was that covering tuition and fees was usually not the real problem most community college students face. Most of them face a more difficult problem, and that is they are not adequately academically prepared or they have other problems in their lives, whether it is from their homes or jobs or whatever. It is hard for them to stay in college and stay up with the work that they have got to do. And so they need a lot of extra help. And the President doesn't talk about that.

Now here is the worst thing about this proposal. We heard a lot last night from the President of the United States that he was all about the middle class. Let me tell you one of the taxes that he is going to raise that is going to pay for these proposals. He is going to tax 529 plans.

For people that don't know what those are, 529 plans are savings accounts, essentially, that moms and

dads and grandmoms and granddads put money in over time and they use that money that they saved over time to put their young people through college. And the good thing about that is while they pay taxes on the money that they make before they put it into the plans, if, when they take the money out of those plans, there has been some appreciation—it has gone from being this much money to that much money—they don't have to pay taxes on it.

It is an incentive for them. It is a way for middle class people to save for college for their young people. It is the only way middle class people in this country have a real savings plan for the young people. And this President, who stood up right behind me last night and talked about being for the middle class, wants to tax those middle class savings plans and take them away from people. Twelve million people use those plans in this country, 12 million people like my parents, like my wife and me, and like many, many other people in America. They shouldn't have their plans taxed.

So I say to my colleagues from Florida and Illinois, if you look at just that one part of what he proposed, it is hard to say he was serious. Because if he really cares about higher education in America, he would think about the other needs of these community college students. But most importantly, he would think about those 12 million parents that are saving for their young people, middle class people whom he is trying to take money away from with this proposed tax.

I think that sort of gives you a flavor of my appreciation of that one part of what he said last night.

Mr. JOLLY. You bring much education experience as a layperson but also somebody with very specific political convictions. The President talked about free community college. And as an example, he used two local areas that now provide it. Well, I think that is the point of departure for our view of government.

If a local community decides that they want to provide education through whatever tax levy that the residents there might support, that is a great opportunity. But to suggest that somehow Washington, which so often fails in orchestrating through the heavy hand of government a new type of education economics, is going to work better than those two communities that he cited last night is exactly where the view of government between our side of the aisle and his begins to depart.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I would like to know how many community colleges the administration contacted to talk about whether or not this was a good idea. The example that I have heard since this idea was put forth was that Tennessee is going to do

it. Well, great for Tennessee, because they are probably going to use their lottery funds, from what I have read, to pay for it.

Let me give you an example in Illinois, where I live, the President's home State. Unless we are going to get a brand new crop of lotto players, if the lotto is going to fund it, then you know what? That money would be robbed from our K through 12 system to create what is tantamount to grades 13 and 14 in our community colleges, which may not have the faculty or may not have the facilities to handle the influx—and then to top it off by taxing savings plans that many middle class Americans have been using to be able to send their children to college at a time when the cost to go to any college is rising exponentially much faster than the inflation rate.

I don't know if this is a conflict of interest or not because this is just a proposal from the White House, but I have a 529 plan. We have been saving for my three kids to go to college. And to be taxed now, after investing since they were very young—my daughter is now 17—I can tell you from the standpoint as a dad that I can empathize with many families who aren't in the financial position that we are able to be in because we are blessed enough to serve our districts in this institution.

It is flabbergasting to me to be able to hear the President talk about these great ideas. Frankly, I just don't know how many of us sat in this room last night and believed that it was going to get beyond the idea stage. And I don't know how much effort he is going to put in to try and pass this plan, but I would urge our colleagues to take a good, hard look at this and also never forget the possible impact it is going to have on our 4-year institutions, both private and public. I serve nine of those in my district in Illinois. What kind of impact is it going to have on those institutions when you take a good percentage of students that will now go, if his plan is implemented, to the community colleges, which provide a great education?

I would love to hear more about what you think and the impact it might have on the community college systems that you are so familiar with, Mr. BYRNE.

Mr. BYRNE. That is an important point because when you look at education, there are different parts of it. Each part serves its own special need. The 4-year colleges are different from the 2-year colleges, and they are different from high schools, et cetera. So there is a role that each of them play, but sometimes we start fuzzing them together and we miss the importance of each one of them.

I think there will be some negative effects on 4-year colleges. I already heard from some 4-year college people about that. They don't want to pick on the 2-year colleges because they don't want to be seen to do that, but they understand there could be some negative effects.

But the point you and the gentleman from Florida were making that is even more important to this, these are mainly local and State decisions. The Federal Government is inserting itself in things that traditionally, under our Federal understanding of government, the Federal Government didn't get involved in.

I talked to our colleagues in this House from the State of Tennessee, Democrat and Republican, and said, What do you think about us taking your Tennessee plan and nationalizing it? They said, We think it's a bad idea. We are proud of our Tennessee plan. We think it's a good plan. We're proud that our State is doing it.

It is one thing to talk about it from a State level—I understand they have one in Chicago at the local level—but it is different when you blow it up to be a national thing.

So the President wants to take this good idea from a single State or a single city and blow it up into a national thing, and we are not really stoked here to do that. We don't really understand how to do that.

Here is what happens now: we send the money out. And what happens after we send the money? Rules and regulations and mandates come flowing down after it, and Washington starts telling Tennessee and Illinois and Florida and Alabama how to run our colleges. And that, my friends, is a very bad idea. I don't think anybody in higher education wants the heavy hand of the Federal Government telling us how to run our institutions of higher education.

Let me end on this one point. America is known as having the best institutions of higher education in the world. And the reason we do is because each one of our institutions is different from one another. They specialize in who they are and they focus on quality. And if we start robbing that from them by trying to stamp some one-size-fits-all concept of higher education, which the President is trying to do right now with this rating system he wants to put on higher education, then we may start losing in an area in which we are the preeminent leader in the world. And I don't think the people of Alabama sent me here to let the Federal Government do that to the fine institutions of higher education we have in the State of Alabama.

Mr. JOLLY. In our remaining time, I would like to revisit another topic—it is one on which I think the solutions on our side of the aisle reflect the will of the people that we saw at the ballot box in November—and that is border security.

□ 1715

We need to reclaim this issue, as conservatives. We need to redefine this national conversation. The President likes to continually say that if Congress would just send him a bill, then all would be okay, and it is usually followed by suggesting that if we send a

bill that we pass, he will veto it. What he means is we have to send him his bill.

I just want to point out something because we do have solutions on this side of this aisle, and we have acted responsibly on behalf of that. In July, we passed a border security bill that put facilities closer to the border to keep those who enter illegally closer to the border.

We changed the policy to “last in, first out,” so if you get in, you don’t get to linger for years before you are returned if you don’t have a humanitarian claim that merits staying.

We also increased funding for judges, created tele-courtrooms so that we could more expeditiously process those who come here illegally—and rightfully so—and we should do so very responsibly. We are a loving nation made better for immigration, but we should show everybody the rule of law and how you responsibly immigrate here.

Mind you, we also passed a bill that provided for the health care of those who come here and while they are detained here, but I want to point out something very specific. In the coming weeks, this Congress is going to offer another bill—because that one was never accepted by the Senate or went to the President—to require operational control of our border.

That is a great urgency, to have operational control of our border, not to just address the traditional border security issue, but to address what we know is a growing concern about our domestic and homeland security.

We have seen the threats around the globe. Most certainly, that has to be an area where we can reach agreement with the White House, and I hope we can take up the President on his offer to put a bill on his desk and ask him to sign it, just as he has pledged to do so.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to the gentleman for yielding, and you bring up a great point. This isn’t just a border security issue because of an immigration issue. This is a border security issue because of a homeland security issue.

We have to make our border secure. We are going to have what our vision for border security is in this institution pass now to the Senate, and the President will get his wish. We will put a bill on his desk. It may not be the bill he wants, but my message to the administration—to the White House—is: come work with us.

In my first 2 years here, I just haven’t seen that happen on a wide variety of issues. It seems like every idea that we come up with in this institution, even some that passed by huge bipartisan majorities, they threaten a veto. Well, that is okay, but that is not conducive to working together to find solutions, and that is what I think we are here for.

I think we, on this side, there are many of us who are out here to find solutions to the Nation’s problems, not to create more problems, and that is exactly the message I hope to send to the American people tonight, that we are willing to work with the President on border security, on education, on a wide variety of issues, but we also have to have some response back, and that is what I think we are lacking.

Mr. BYRNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. I am on the Armed Services Committee, and I look at border security as national security.

Let me give you a story from a trip that several of us on the Armed Services Committee took to the Middle East back in August and September. We visited several countries over there. As you know, it is a very dangerous part of the world, clearly.

One of the countries we went to is Morocco. Morocco, if you think about where it is, should have lots of problems, but you don’t really hear much about Morocco having terrorist incidents. When we were over there, we asked a lot of questions. How is that so?

It is because they take their border security very seriously. They use a lot of the military aid that America provides to Morocco for their border security, and they keep the bad guys out, and so you don’t hear in this country that is in some of the most troubled parts of the world, you don’t hear about the problems there because they control their borders. They understand that their internal and national security is dependent upon that.

We had two brothers, the Tsarnaev brothers, who grew up in Boston. One of them was allowed to go back to where they were from and one of the satellite countries from Russia—obviously was trained by terrorists.

We allowed him to come back into this country, after we were warned by the Russians where he had gone, and he and his brother tragically ignited those bombs at the Boston Marathon, seriously wounding a lot of people and killing some.

Well, what sort of a security situation do we have that we allowed him back into this country? What sort of security situation do we have today?

This is not just about the southern border; it is about the northern border. It is about our security of the entire Nation, and if we will start looking at border security as national security, which is the way we on this side of the aisle understand this issue, then we can protect the American people.

It definitely does take us working with the President because he runs the Department of Homeland Security through his appointee to that Secretary’s position, and it is his policies through that Department that determine whether or not we are going to be protected, and protecting our borders

is a part of protecting Americans from international terrorism, including international Islamic terrorism.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. DAVIS, any more comments this evening?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. If the gentleman would inquire how much time we have left.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am just excited to be able to talk about what happened at the State of the Union last night, our perspective. In closing, it kind of frustrates me that we didn’t see real solutions to the exploding cost of higher education.

If the solution is what the President laid out, which is going to actually put more of a burden on middle class families by taxing their savings plans that they have been saving for—for sometimes decades—that is a wrong approach to bringing down the cost of higher education to making Pell grants go further.

The President also mentioned another point last night about equal pay. Well, it would have been nice to have the President and the White House actually do that in the White House, where women make an average of 18 percent less than men, so it is not just enough to talk about it here in this Chamber. Do it when you have control over the opportunity to make things happen.

That is why I hope it is not just rhetoric on many issues, but I want to see action.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this time. I hope what the American people have seen and our colleagues have seen is a Congress with solutions.

We will be passing through this House border security solutions, a homeland security solution. Frankly, addressing the constitutional overreach we saw from the President, we will be passing energy independence solutions, education solutions, tax reform solutions. We are committed to doing that on behalf of the American people.

I look forward to working with our colleagues, and frankly, we remain hopeful that we will have the opportunity to work with the President on this as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### WHY WE ARE REALLY HERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is January 22, 2015. It



marks exactly 42 years to the day since the tragedy called *Roe v. Wade* was first handed down from the United States Supreme Court. Since then, every foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of more than 55 million of its own unborn children. Incomprehensibly, those who have profited from it most have hailed it as freedom.

We should all remember the words of President Abraham Lincoln when he said:

Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves and, under a just God, cannot long retain it.

Mr. Lincoln called upon all of us to remember America's Founding Fathers, and "their enlightened belief that nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on or degraded and imbruted by its fellows."

He reminded those he called posterity that when, in the distant future, some man, some factions, some interests should set up a doctrine that some were not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that "their posterity"—that is us, Mr. Speaker—that "their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their Fathers began."

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of all of those who founded this Nation and dreamed of what America could someday be and for the sake of all of those since then who have died in darkness so America could walk in the light of freedom, it is so very important that those of us who are privileged to be Members of the United States Congress pause from time to time and remind ourselves of why we are really all here.

Thomas Jefferson, whose words marked the beginning of this Nation said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government."

The phrase in the Fifth Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says that no person shall be "deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

The 14th Amendment says no State shall deny "to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights is why we are all here; yet, today, a great shadow looms over America. When authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Kermit Gosnell, they found a torture chamber for little babies that defies description within the constraints of the English language.

According to the grand jury report:

Dr. Kermit Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies. He killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it "ensuring fetal demise." The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it "snipping." Over the years, there were hundreds of "snippings."

Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breath-

ing, and she defined one as 2 feet long that no longer had eyes or a mouth but, in her words, was making like this "screeching" noise, and it "sounded like a little alien."

For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, is this who we truly are? Kermit Gosnell now rightfully sits in prison for killing a mother and murdering innocent children like the one I just described; yet, if he had killed these babies only 5 minutes earlier and before they had passed through the birth canal, it would have all been perfectly legal in much of the United States of America.

If there is one thing that we must not miss about this unspeakably evil episode, it is that Kermit Gosnell is not an anomaly; he is just the visible face of this lucrative enterprise of murdering pain-capable unborn children in America.

Mr. Speaker, more than 18,000 very late-term abortions are occurring in America every year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their pain-capable unborn babies to torture and death without anesthesia. It is the greatest atrocity in the United States.

According to the Bartlett study, a woman seeking an abortion at 20 weeks is 35 times more likely to die from an abortion than she was in the first trimester. At 21 weeks or more, she is 91 times more likely to die than she was in the first trimester.

Regardless of how supporters of abortion on demand might try to suppress it, it is undisputed and universally accepted by every credible expert that the risk to a mother's health from abortion increases as gestation increases.

There is no valid debate on that incontrovertible reality; yet supporters of abortion on demand try to suppress that.

□ 1730

They also have tried for decades, Mr. Speaker, to deny that unborn babies ever feel pain, even those at the beginning of the sixth month of pregnancy, as if somehow the ability to feel pain magically develops the very second the child is born.

Mr. Speaker, almost every other major civilized nation on this Earth protects pain-capable unborn babies at this age, and every credible poll of the American people shows that they are overwhelmingly in favor of protecting these children. Yet we have given these little babies less legal protection from unnecessary pain and cruelty than the protection we have given farm animals under the Federal Humane Slaughter Act. Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy that beggars my ability to articulate.

But I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the winds of change are beginning to blow and that the tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America. Because tomorrow we will vote on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber, and it will be a vote that every one of us will

always remember and for which we shall be held accountable.

And no matter how it is shouted down or what distortions, deceptive what-ifs, distractions, diversions, gotchas, twisted words, changing the subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, it remains a deeply sincere effort, beginning at their sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and their pain-capable unborn babies from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand; and ultimately, Mr. Speaker, it is one all humane Americans can support if they truly understand it for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, not long ago, I heard Barack Obama speak very noble and poignant words that, whether he realizes it or not, apply so profoundly to this subject. Let me quote, if you will, excerpted portions of his comments. He said: "This is our first task, caring for our children. It's our first job. If we don't get that right, we don't get anything right. That's how, as a society, we will be judged."

The President asked: "Are we really prepared to say that we're powerless in the face of such carnage, that the politics are too hard? Are we prepared to say that such violence visited on our children year after year after year is somehow the price of our freedom?"

The President also said: "Our journey is not complete until all our children are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm."

"That is our generation's task—to make these words, these rights, these values of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness real for every American."

Mr. Speaker, never have I so deeply agreed with any words ever spoken by President Obama as those I have just quoted. How I wish that somehow we could all open our hearts and our ears to these incontrovertible words and ask ourselves in the core of our souls why these words that should apply to all children cannot include the most helpless and vulnerable of all children. How does any child become more vulnerable than these little pain-capable unborn babies?

Mr. Speaker, it seems that we are never quite so eloquent as when we decry the crimes of a past generation, and we are never quite so staggeringly blind as when we assess an atrocity in our own time.

What we are doing to these babies is real, and all of us here know that in our hearts. Medical science regarding the development of unborn babies beginning at the sixth month of pregnancy now demonstrates irrefutably that they do, in fact, feel pain. Many of them cry and scream as they die, but because it is amniotic fluid going over the vocal cords instead of air, we can't hear them. It is, Mr. Speaker, the greatest human rights atrocity in the United States of America today.

I began and I close with the wise counsel from Abraham Lincoln to all of

us. He said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the last generation."

Mr. Speaker, it is time to open our eyes and our souls and recognize that protecting pain-capable unborn children and their mothers is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. It is a test of our basic humanity and who we are as a human family. It is time to open our eyes and allow our consciences to catch up with our technology. It is time for Members of the United States Congress to open our eyes and recognize that protecting those who cannot protect themselves is why we are all here. And, Mr. Speaker, it is time for all Americans to open our eyes and our hearts to the humanity of these little unborn children of God and the inhumanity of what is being done to them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 416

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove all cosponsors from H.R. 416.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2150

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2015

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-4) on the resolution (H. Res. 42) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and January 22.

#### PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

##### RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, as required by clause 2(a) of House rule XI, I respectfully submit for the RECORD the rules of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which were adopted earlier today at a public meeting of the Committee.

##### 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives, and in particular, the committee rules enumerated in clause 2 of rule XI, are the rules of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (hereafter referred to as the "Committee"), to the extent applicable.

(b) A motion to recess and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are privileged non-debatable motions in Committee.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall consult the Ranking Minority Member to the extent possible with respect to the business of the Committee. Each subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules, to the extent applicable.

##### 2. DATE OF MEETING

The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the first Tuesday of every month when the House of Representatives is in session pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as the Chairman may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the Members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the Chairman subject to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no business to be considered.

##### 3. QUORUM

For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two Members shall constitute a quorum, and the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall make every effort to ensure that the relevant Ranking Minority Member or another Minority Member is present at the time a hearing is convened. One-third of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, except: (1) reporting a measure or recommendation; (2) closing Committee meetings and hearings to the public; (3) authorizing the issuance of subpoenas; and (4) any other action for which an actual majority quorum is required by any rule of the House of Representatives or by law. No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present. No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the full Committee by a subcommittee unless half of the subcommittee is actually present. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the Members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one Member.

##### 4. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

###### (a) Meetings

(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public, because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise violate any labor rule of the House of Representatives. No person other than Members of the Committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Committee or subcommittee may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This subsection does not apply to open Committee hearings which are provided for by subsection (b) of this rule.

(2) The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter, or adopting an amendment. The relevant Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time. When exercising postponement authority, the relevant Chairman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify Members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

###### (b) Hearings

(1) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day should be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony—

(A) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or violate paragraph (2) of this subsection; or

(B) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) Whenever it is asserted by a Member of the Committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness—

(A) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence or

testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(B) the Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(3) No Member of the House of Representatives may be excluded from non-participatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee unless the House of Representatives has by majority vote authorized the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings, on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this subsection for closing hearings to the public.

(4) A Member of the House of Representatives who is not a Member of the Committee may not be recognized to participate in a Committee or Subcommittee hearing except by the unanimous consent of Committee Members present at such hearing. Participatory recognition of a non-Committee Member shall occur only after all Committee Members seeking recognition, both majority and minority, have had their opportunity to participate and question any witnesses.

(5) The Committee or a subcommittee may by the procedure designated in this subsection vote to close one (1) subsequent day of hearing.

(6) No congressional staff shall be present at any meeting or hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee that has been closed to the public, and at which classified information will be involved, unless such person is authorized access to such classified information in accordance with rule XX of the House of Representatives.

#### 5. CONVENING HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

(a) Hearings. Public announcement shall be made of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee at the earliest possible date, and in any event at least one (1) week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the relevant Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin a hearing sooner, or if the Committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the Committee for the taking of action, the Chairman of the full Committee, if concurring, shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(b) Markups and Other Meetings to Transact Business

(1) Convening. The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee may call or convene, as the relevant Chairman considers necessary, meetings of the Committee or subcommittee for the consideration of a bill or resolution pending before the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, or for the conduct of other Committee or subcommittee business.

(2) Notice. Public announcement shall be made by the Chairman of the full Committee of the date, place, and subject matter of any markup or other meeting to conduct business at the earliest possible date, and in any event at least one (1) week before the commencement of such markup or meeting, unless the relevant Chairman determines, in consultation with the relevant Ranking Minority Member, that there is good cause to begin such a markup or meeting on an earlier date. If such determination is made, the Chairman of the full Committee, if concur-

ring in that determination, shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(3) Agenda and Texts. The relevant Chairman shall provide to all Committee or subcommittee Members an agenda for each Committee and subcommittee markup or other meeting to transact business, setting out all items of business to be considered, including whenever possible a copy of any measure scheduled for markup, at least 48 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) before the meeting.

Bills on subjects not listed on such agenda shall be subject to a point of order unless their consideration is agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the Committee or subcommittee, or by the Chairman of the full Committee with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member. The text of any measure to be marked up shall be made publicly available in electronic form at least 24 hours prior to the commencement of the markup meeting, or at the time of an announcement under subparagraph (b)(2) made within 24 hours before such meeting.

(c) Publication. Public announcement of all hearings and markups shall be published in the Daily Digest portion of the Congressional Record and made publicly available in electronic form. Members shall be notified by the Staff Director of all meetings (including markups and hearings) and briefings of subcommittees and of the full Committee.

(d) Member Seating. During Committee and subcommittee hearings and markups, chairs on the dais are for Members. No staff member other than a Committee or subcommittee staff director, counsel, or professional staff member may occupy a chair on the dais, unless authorized by the Chairman of the full Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Full Committee. Only one staff member each from the majority and the minority may occupy chairs on the dais at any time during a hearing or markup.

#### 6. WITNESSES

##### (a) Interrogation of Witnesses

(1) In so far as practicable, witnesses shall be permitted to present their oral statements without interruption subject to reasonable time constraints imposed by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, with questioning by the Committee Members taking place afterward. Members should refrain from questions until such statements are completed.

(2) In recognizing Members, the relevant Chairman shall, to the extent practicable, give preference to the Members on the basis of their arrival at the hearing, taking into consideration the majority and minority ratio of the Members actually present. A Member desiring to speak or ask a question shall address the relevant Chairman and not the witness.

(3) Subject to paragraph (4), each Member may interrogate the witness for 5 minutes, the reply of the witness being included in the 5-minute period. After all Members have had an opportunity to ask questions, the round shall begin again under the 5-minute rule.

(4) Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the relevant Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, may permit one (1) or more majority Members of the Committee designated by the relevant Chairman to question a witness for a specified period of not longer than 30 minutes. On such occasions, an equal number of minority Members of the Committee designated by the Ranking Minority Member shall be permitted to question the same witness for the same period of time. Committee staff may be permitted to question a witness for equal specified periods either with the concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full

Committee or by motion. However, in no case may questioning by Committee staff proceed before each Member of the Committee who wishes to speak under the 5-minute rule has had one opportunity to do so.

##### (b) Testimony of Witnesses

(1) Advance Filing Requirement. Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee is required to file testimony with the Committee or subcommittee at least two (2) business days in advance of that appearance. For purposes of this subsection, testimony includes the written statement of a witness, as well as any video, photographs, audio-visual matter, posters, or other supporting materials that the witness intends to present or display before the Committee. Such testimony should be provided in electronic form to the extent practicable. The Committee or subcommittee shall notify Members at least two business days in advance of a hearing of the availability of testimony submitted by witnesses. In addition, each witness shall provide sufficient copies, as determined by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, of his or her proposed written statement to be provided to Members and staff of the Committee or subcommittee, the news media, and the general public. The text of the written statement provided pursuant to this paragraph shall be considered final, and may not be revised by the witness after the Committee meeting at which the witness appears.

(2) Witness Preclusion and Waiver. The requirements of paragraph (1) or any part thereof may be waived by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, or the presiding Member, or the Ranking Member of the Committee or subcommittee as it relates to witnesses who are called by the minority to testify, provided that the witness or the relevant Chairman or Ranking Minority Member has submitted, prior to the witness's appearance, a written explanation to the reasons testimony has not been made available to the Committee or subcommittee. If a witness who is not an official of the U.S. Government has not submitted testimony as required by paragraph (1) and no such written explanation has been submitted, the witness shall be released from testifying unless a majority of the Committee or subcommittee votes to accept his or her testimony.

(3) Remote Witness Participation. The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall promptly, and not later than 48 hours beforehand if possible, notify the relevant Ranking Member of any witness who is likely to present testimony other than in person, such as by videoconference. A witness may not testify via telephone or other audio-only medium without the concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee or subcommittee. The relevant Chairman shall make reasonable efforts to verify the identity of any witness participating remotely.

(4) 'Truth In Testimony' Disclosure. In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall, to the extent practicable, include: a curriculum vitae; a disclosure of the amount and source of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof), or of any contract or payment originating with a foreign government, received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness, to the extent that such information is relevant to the subject matter of, and the witness' representational capacity at, the hearing; and a disclosure of whether the witness is an active registrant under the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA).

Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy, safety, or security of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

(5) Witness Presentation. A witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a brief summary of his or her written statement.

(6) Translation. A witness requiring an interpreter or translator should include in the testimony provided pursuant to paragraph (1) the identity of the interpreter or translator that the witness intends to use. Unless properly noticed as a separate witness, an interpreter or translator appearing before the Committee should not present views or statements other than those expressed by the witness.

(c) Oaths. The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, or any Member of the Committee designated by the relevant Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness appearing before the Committee.

#### 7. PREPARATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMMITTEE RECORDS

An accurate stenographic record shall be made of all hearings and markup sessions. Members of the Committee and any witness may examine the transcript of his or her own remarks and may make any grammatical or technical changes that do not substantively alter the record. Any such Member or witness shall return the transcript to the Committee offices within seven (7) calendar days (not including Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after receipt of the transcript, or as soon thereafter as is practicable.

Any information supplied for the record at the request of a Member of the Committee shall be provided to the Member when received by the Committee.

Transcripts of hearings and markup sessions (except for the record of a meeting or hearing which is closed to the public) shall be printed as soon as is practicable after receipt of the corrected versions, except that the Chairman may order the transcript of a hearing to be printed without the corrections of a Member or witness if the Chairman determines that such Member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time to correct such transcript and such transcript has not been returned within such time.

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

The Committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible, make its publications available in electronic form.

#### 8. EXTRANEOUS MATERIALS IN COMMITTEE HEARINGS PRINTS

No extraneous material shall be printed in either the body or appendices of any Committee or subcommittee hearing, except matter which has been accepted for inclusion in the record during the hearing or by agreement of the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee within five (5) calendar days of the hearing. Copies of bills and other legislation under consideration and responses to written questions submitted by Members shall not be considered extraneous material.

Extraneous material in either the body or appendices of any hearing to be printed which would be in excess of eight (8) printed pages (for any one submission) shall be ac-

companied by a written request to the relevant Chairman. Such written request shall contain an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing such material.

#### 9. INFORMATION ON COMMITTEE ACTION

(a) Record Votes. The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee outside of executive session shall be made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote. Such result shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each Member voting for and against, and the Members present but not voting.

(b) Adopted Amendments. Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee, the text of each such amendment shall be made publicly available in electronic form.

(c) Hearing and Markup Attendance. Member attendance at each Committee hearing and markup shall be recorded and included in the Committee print of the transcript of that hearing or markup.

#### 10. PROXIES

Proxy voting is not permitted in the Committee or in subcommittees.

#### 11. REPORTS

(a) Reports on Bills and Resolutions. To the extent practicable, not later than 24 hours before a report is to be filed with the Clerk of the House on a measure that has been ordered reported by the Committee, the Chairman shall make available for inspection by all Members of the Committee a copy of the draft Committee report in order to afford Members adequate information and the opportunity to draft and file any supplemental, minority or additional views which they may deem appropriate.

With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those Members voting for and against, shall be included in any Committee report on the measure or matter.

(b) Prior Approval of Certain Reports. No Committee, subcommittee, or staff report, study, or other document which purports to express publicly the views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the Committee or a subcommittee may be released to the public or filed with the Clerk of the House unless approved by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to Members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day). In any case in which clause 2(l) of rule XI and clause 3(a)(1) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives does not apply, each Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall be given an opportunity to have views or a disclaimer included as part of the material filed or released, as the case may be.

(c) Foreign Travel Reports. At the same time that the report required by clause 8(b)(3) of rule X of the House of Representatives, regarding foreign travel reports, is submitted to the Chairman, Members and employees of the Committee shall provide a report to the Chairman listing all official meetings, interviews, inspection tours and other official functions in which the individual participated, by country and date. Under extraordinary circumstances, the Chairman may waive the listing in such report of an official meeting, interview, inspection tour, or other official function. The re-

port shall be maintained in the Committee offices and shall be available for public inspection during normal business hours. Except in extraordinary circumstances, no Member or employee of the Committee will be authorized for additional Committee travel until the reports described in this subsection have been submitted to the Chairman for that person's prior Committee travel.

#### 12. REPORTING BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Except in extraordinary circumstances, bills and resolutions will not be considered by the Committee unless and until the appropriate subcommittee has recommended the bill or resolution for Committee action, and will not be taken to the House of Representatives for action unless and until the Committee or a relevant subcommittee has ordered reported such bill or resolution, a quorum being present.

Except in extraordinary circumstances, a bill or resolution originating in the House of Representatives that contains exclusively findings and policy declarations or expressions of the sense of the House of Representatives or the sense of the Congress shall not be considered by the Committee or a subcommittee unless such bill or resolution has at least 25 House co-sponsors, at least 10 of whom are Members of the Committee.

For purposes of this rule, extraordinary circumstances will be determined by the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member and such other Members of the Committee as the Chairman deems appropriate.

The Committee or a subcommittee shall not consider a bill or resolution originating in the House of Representatives that expresses appreciation, commends, congratulates, celebrates, recognizes the accomplishments of, or celebrates the anniversary of, an entity, event, group, individual, institution, team, or government program, or that acknowledges or recognizes a period of time for such purposes, except in circumstances determined by the Chairman with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member.

The Chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

#### 13. STAFF SERVICES

The Committee staff shall be selected and organized so that it can provide a comprehensive range of professional services in the field of foreign affairs to the Committee, the subcommittees, and all its Members. The staff shall include persons with training and experience in foreign affairs, making available to the Committee individuals with knowledge of major countries, areas, and U.S. overseas programs and operations.

Subject to clause 9 of rule X of the House of Representatives, the staff of the Committee, except as provided in paragraph (c), shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chairman with the approval of the majority of the Members in the majority party of the Committee. Their remuneration shall be fixed by the Chairman, and they shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman. Staff assignments are to be authorized by the Chairman or by the Staff Director under the direction of the Chairman.

Subject to clause 9 of rule X of the House of Representatives, the staff of the Committee assigned to the minority shall be appointed, their remuneration determined, and may be removed, by the Ranking Minority Member with the approval of the majority of the minority party Members of the Committee. Such staff shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member with the approval or

consultation of the minority Members of the Committee.

The Chairman shall ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee. The Chairman shall ensure that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff.

#### 14. NUMBER AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Full Committee. The full Committee will be responsible for oversight and legislation relating to: foreign assistance (including development assistance, Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Millennium Challenge Account, HIV/AIDS in foreign countries, security assistance, and Public Law 480 programs abroad); national security developments affecting foreign policy; strategic planning and agreements; war powers, treaties, executive agreements, and the deployment and use of United States Armed Forces; peacekeeping, peace enforcement, and enforcement of United Nations or other international sanctions; arms control and disarmament issues; the United States Agency for International Development; activities and policies of the State, Commerce, and Defense Departments and other agencies related to the Arms Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act, including export and licensing policy for munitions items and technology and dual-use equipment and technology; international law; promotion of democracy; international law enforcement issues, including narcotics control programs and activities; Broadcasting Board of Governors; embassy security; international broadcasting; public diplomacy, including international communication and information policy, and international education and exchange programs; and all other matters not specifically assigned to a subcommittee. The full Committee will have jurisdiction over legislation with respect to the administration of the Export Administration Act, including the export and licensing of dual-use equipment and technology and other matters related to international economic policy and trade not otherwise assigned to a subcommittee, and with respect to the United Nations, its affiliated agencies, and other international organizations, including assessed and voluntary contributions to such organizations. The full Committee may conduct oversight and investigations with respect to any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee as defined in the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Subcommittees. There shall be six (6) standing subcommittees. The names and jurisdiction of those subcommittees shall be as follows:

(1) Functional Subcommittee. There shall be one subcommittee with functional jurisdiction:

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade: Oversight and legislative responsibilities over the United States' efforts to manage and coordinate international programs to combat terrorism as coordinated by the Department of State and other agencies, and efforts to bring international terrorists to justice. With the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee, oversight of, and legislation pertaining to, nonproliferation matters involving nuclear, chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction, except for legislation involving the Foreign Assistance Act, the Arms Export Control Act, the Export Administration Act, and sanctions laws pertaining to individual countries and the provision of foreign assistance (which is reserved to the full Committee). Oversight of matters relating to international economic and trade policy; commerce with foreign countries; inter-

national investment policy; the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Trade and Development Agency; commodity agreements; and special oversight of international financial and monetary institutions; the Export-Import Bank, and customs. With the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee, legislative jurisdiction over measures related to export promotion and measures related to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Trade and Development Agency.

(2) Regional Subcommittees. There shall be five subcommittees with regional jurisdiction: the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations; the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific; the Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats; the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa; and the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere. As detailed below, two of the regional subcommittees also shall have functional jurisdiction.

The regional subcommittees shall have jurisdiction over the following within their respective regions:

(1) Matters affecting the political relations between the United States and other countries and regions, including resolutions or other legislative measures directed to such relations.

(2) Legislation with respect to disaster assistance outside the Foreign Assistance Act, boundary issues, and international claims.

(3) Legislation with respect to region- or country-specific loans or other financial relations outside the Foreign Assistance Act.

(4) Legislation and oversight regarding human rights practices in particular countries.

(5) Oversight of regional lending institutions.

(6) Oversight of matters related to the regional activities of the United Nations, of its affiliated agencies, and of other multilateral institutions.

(7) Identification and development of options for meeting future problems and issues relating to U.S. interests in the region.

(8) Oversight of base rights and other facilities access agreements and regional security pacts.

(9) Concurrent oversight jurisdiction with respect to matters assigned to the functional subcommittees insofar as they may affect the region.

(10) Oversight of foreign assistance activities affecting the region, with the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee.

(11) Such other matters as the Chairman of the full Committee may determine.

The Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations: In addition to its regional jurisdiction, oversight of: international health issues, including transboundary infectious diseases, maternal health and child survival, and programs related to the global ability to address health issues; population issues; the United Nations and its affiliated agencies (excluding peacekeeping and enforcement of United Nations or other international sanctions); the American Red Cross; and the Peace Corps. In addition, legislation and oversight pertaining to: implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; other matters relating to internationally-recognized human rights, including legislation aimed at the promotion of human rights and democracy generally; and the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, and related issues.

The Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats: In addition to its regional jurisdiction, with the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee, over-

sight related to emerging foreign threats to the national security and interests of the United States.

#### 15. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) In General. Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it.

(b) Scheduling. Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, other subcommittee chairmen, the relevant Ranking Minority Member and other appropriate Members, with a view toward minimizing scheduling conflicts. Subcommittee meetings shall not be scheduled to occur simultaneously with meetings of the full Committee. Hearings shall not be scheduled to occur prior to the first vote or subsequent to the last vote of a legislative week, or outside of Washington, D.C., without prior consultation with the relevant Ranking Minority Member. In order to ensure orderly administration and fair assignment of hearing and meeting rooms, the subject, time, and location of hearings and meetings shall be arranged in advance with the Chairman through the Staff Director of the Committee.

(c) Vice Chairmen. The Chairman of the Full Committee shall designate a Member of the majority party on each subcommittee as its vice chairman.

(d) Participation. The Chairman of the full Committee and the Ranking Minority Member may attend the meetings and participate in the activities of all subcommittees of which they are not Members, except that they may not vote or be counted for a quorum in such subcommittees.

(e) Required Oversight Hearings. During each 180-day period following organization of the Committee, each subcommittee shall hold at least one hearing on oversight of U.S. Government activities.

#### 16. REFERRAL OF BILLS BY CHAIRMAN

In accordance with rule 14 of the Committee and to the extent practicable, all legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred by the Chairman to a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction within two (2) weeks. In accordance with rule 14 of the Committee, legislation may also be referred to additional subcommittees for consideration. Unless otherwise directed by the Chairman, such subcommittees shall act on or be discharged from consideration of legislation that has been approved by the subcommittee of primary jurisdiction within two (2) weeks of such action. In referring any legislation to a subcommittee, the Chairman may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the full Committee.

Subcommittees with regional jurisdiction shall have joint jurisdiction with the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations over legislation regarding human rights practices in particular countries within their regions.

The Chairman may designate a subcommittee Chairman or other Member to take responsibility as manager of a bill or resolution during its consideration in the House of Representatives.

#### 17. PARTY RATIOS ON SUBCOMMITTEES AND CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

The majority party caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority party Members for each subcommittee. Party representation on each subcommittee or conference committee shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the full Committee. The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member are authorized to negotiate matters

affecting such ratios including the size of subcommittees and conference committees.

#### 18. SUBCOMMITTEE FUNDING AND RECORDS

Each subcommittee shall have adequate funds to discharge its responsibility for legislation and oversight.

In order to facilitate Committee compliance with clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, each subcommittee shall keep a complete record of all subcommittee actions which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. The result of each record vote shall be promptly made available to the full Committee for inspection by the public in accordance with rule 9 of the Committee.

All subcommittee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as Chairman of the subcommittee. Subcommittee records shall be coordinated with the records of the full Committee, shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

#### 19. MEETINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

The Chairman shall call a meeting of the subcommittee chairmen on a regular basis not less frequently than once a month. Such a meeting need not be held if there is no business to conduct. It shall be the practice at such meetings to review the current agenda and activities of each of the subcommittees.

#### 20. ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

(a) Authorized Persons. In accordance with the stipulations of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all Members of the House who have executed the oath required by clause 13 of rule XXIII of the House of Representatives shall be authorized to have access to classified information within the possession of the Committee.

Members of the Committee staff shall be considered authorized to have access to classified information within the possession of the Committee when they have the proper security clearances, when they have executed the oath required by clause 13 of rule XXIII of the House of Representatives, and when they have a demonstrable need to know. The decision on whether a given staff member has a need to know will be made on the following basis:

(1) In the case of the full Committee majority staff, by the Chairman, acting through the Staff Director;

(2) In the case of the full Committee minority staff, by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, acting through the Minority Staff Director;

(3) In the case of subcommittee majority staff, by the chairman of the subcommittee;

(4) In the case of the subcommittee minority staff, by the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee.

No other individuals shall be considered authorized persons, unless so designated by the Chairman of the full Committee.

(b) Designated Persons. Each Committee Member is permitted to designate one member of his or her staff as having the right of access to information classified Confidential. Such designated persons must have the proper security clearance, have executed the oath required by clause 13 of rule XXIII of the House of Representatives, and have a need to know as determined by his or her principal. Upon request of a Committee Member in specific instances, a designated person also shall be permitted access to information classified Secret which has been furnished to the Committee pursuant to section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended. Upon the written request of a Committee Member

and with the approval of the Chairman in specific instances, a designated person may be permitted access to other classified materials. Designation of a staff person shall be by letter from the Committee Member to the Chairman.

(c) Location. Classified information will be stored in secure safes in the Office of the Security Officer and in the Office of the Minority Staff Director. All materials classified Top Secret or higher must be stored in a Secure Compartmentalized Information Facility (SCIF).

(d) Handling. Materials classified Confidential or Secret may be taken from Committee offices to other Committee offices and hearing rooms by Members of the Committee and authorized Committee staff in connection with hearings and briefings of the Committee or its subcommittees for which such information is deemed to be essential. Removal of such information from the Committee offices shall be only with the permission of the Chairman under procedures designed to ensure the safe handling and storage of such information at all times. Except as provided in this paragraph, Top Secret materials may not be taken from approved storage areas for any purpose, except that such materials may be taken to hearings and other meetings that are being conducted at the Top Secret level when necessary. Materials classified Top Secret may otherwise be used under conditions approved by the Chairman after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

(e) Notice. Appropriate notice of the receipt of classified documents received by the Committee from the Executive Branch will be sent promptly to Committee Members through the Survey of Activities or by other means.

(f) Access. Except as provided for above, access to materials classified Top Secret or otherwise restricted held by the Committee will be in approved Committee spaces. The following procedures will be observed:

(1) Authorized persons will be permitted access to classified documents after inquiring of the Staff Director or an assigned staff member. Access to the SCIF will be afforded during regular Committee hours.

(2) Authorized persons will be required to identify themselves, to identify the documents or information they wish to view, and to sign the Classified Materials Log, which is kept with the classified information.

(3) The assigned staff member will be responsible for maintaining a log which identifies:

(1) authorized persons seeking access, (2) the classified information requested, and (3) the time of arrival and departure of such persons. The assigned staff member will also assure that the classified materials are returned to the proper location.

(g) Divulgence. Classified information provided to the Committee by the Executive Branch shall be handled in accordance with the procedures that apply within the Executive Branch for the protection of such information. Any classified information to which access has been gained through the Committee may not be divulged to any unauthorized person. Classified material shall not be photocopied or otherwise reproduced. In no event shall classified information be discussed in a non-secure environment. Apparent violations of this rule should be reported as promptly as possible to the Chairman for appropriate action.

(h) Other Regulations. The Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may establish such additional regulations and procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to safeguard classified information under the control of the Committee. Members of the Committee will be

given notice of any such regulations and procedures promptly. They may be modified or waived in any or all particulars by a majority vote of the full Committee.

#### 21. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

All Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings which are open to the public may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any such methods of coverage in accordance with the provisions of clause 3 of House rule XI.

The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall determine, in his or her discretion, the number of television and still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room, but shall not limit the number of television or still cameras to fewer than two (2) representatives from each medium.

Such coverage shall be in accordance with the following requirements contained in section 116(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, and clause 4 of XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

(a) If the television, Internet or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(b) No witness served with a subpoena by the Committee shall be required against his will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, Internet or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This subparagraph is supplementary to clause 2(k)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(c) The allocation among cameras permitted by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee in a hearing room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(d) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and Member of the Committee or its subcommittees or the visibility of that witness and that Member to each other.

(e) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(f) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the Committee or subcommittee is in session.

(g) Floodlights, spotlights, strobe lights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the current state-of-the-art level of television coverage.

(h) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos, United Press International News pictures, and Reuters. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee for coverage of the



hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(i) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the Members of the Committee or its subcommittees.

(j) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(k) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(l) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery Committee of Press Photographers.

(m) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

#### 22. SUBPOENA POWERS

A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Chairman, in accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the Committee, following consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

In addition, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or its subcommittees in accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the House of the Representatives, in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, when authorized by a majority of the Members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present.

Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman or by any Member designated by the Committee.

#### 23. RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Whenever the Speaker is to appoint a conference committee, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees those Members of the Committee who are primarily responsible for the legislation (including to the full extent practicable the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as it passed the House), who have actively participated in the Committee or subcommittee consideration of the legislation, and who agree to attend the meetings of the conference. With regard to the appointment of minority Members, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member.

#### 24. GENERAL OVERSIGHT

Not later than February 15th of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of rule X of the House of Representatives.

In accordance with the provisions of clause 2(n) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, the Committee or a subcommittee thereof shall hold at least one hearing during each 120-day period following its establishment on the topic of waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in programs within its jurisdiction, as documented in reports received from a Federal Office of the Inspector General or the Comptroller General of the United States that have been provided to the

Ranking Minority Member prior to the notice of the hearing pursuant to Committee rule 5.

#### 25. OTHER PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS

The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee. Any additional procedures or regulations may be modified or rescinded in any or all particulars by a majority vote of the full Committee.

### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 22, 2015, at 9 a.m.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

91. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Credit Risk Retention [Docket No.: OCC-2013-0010] (RIN: 1557-AD40) received January 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

92. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Major final rule — Credit Risk Retention [Docket No.: OCC-2013-0010] (RIN: 1557-AD40) received January 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

93. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

94. A letter from the Delegate of the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Education, transmitting notification that, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-270), OMB Circular A-76, and OMB Memo M-12-09, dated March 26, 2012, the Department's report for fiscal years 2012 and 2013 is now available online; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

95. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report entitled "The Impact of Recruitment Strategy on Fair and Open Competition for Federal Jobs", pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

96. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a copy of the charter for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights state advisory committees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

97. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Kent Narrows Draw Bridge Repairs, Kent Island

Narrows; Queen Anne's County, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0898] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

98. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Harmonization of Airworthiness Standards — Gust and Maneuver Load Requirements [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0142; Amdt. No.: 25-141] (RIN: 2120-AK12) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

99. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Damascus (OSTT) Flight Information Region (FIR) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0708; Amendment No.: 91-334; SFAR No.: 114] (RIN: 2120-AK61) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 42. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions (Rept. 114-4). Referred to the House Calendar.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PITTS, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. ROBY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MCHEENRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. BOEHNER):

H.R. 7. A bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DIGGELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY,

Mr. FARR, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BERA, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 20. A bill to reform the financing of Congressional elections by broadening participation by small dollar donors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 423. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the care provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to newborn children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 424. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, to establish a system of public financing for Congressional elections, to promote the disclosure of disbursements made in coordination with campaigns for election for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 425. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the

treatment of coordinated expenditures as contributions to candidates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia):

H.R. 426. A bill to provide that human life shall be deemed to begin with fertilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. JONES, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STEWART, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. YOHO, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLORES, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. HANNA, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BLUM, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LONG, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. SALMON, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COLE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BARR, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. YODER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HARDY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HULTGREEN, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MARINO, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 427. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of

such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 428. A bill to provide for the expedited approval by the Secretary of Energy of liquefied natural gas exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LEE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BASS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BEYER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 429. A bill to provide that in the case of a law enforcement officer who uses deadly force against a person, and thereby causes the death of that person, a hearing shall be conducted before a judge to determine whether there is probable cause for the State to bring criminal charges against the law enforcement officer relating to the death of the person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MOORE, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 430. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. PALMER):

H.R. 431. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. GUINTA):

H.R. 432. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to prevent duplicative regulation of advisers of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DENT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 433. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 523 East Railroad Street in Knox, Pennsylvania, as the "Specialist Ross A. McGinnis Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 434. A bill to repeal certain amendments to the Clean Air Act relating to the expansion of the renewable fuel program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 435. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain Federal lands in Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming, previously identified as suitable for disposal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. ROSELEHTINEN):

H.R. 436. A bill to amend the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to provide a definition of recreational vessel for purposes of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 437. A bill to provide for the retention of the name of Mount McKinley; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 438. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Joanne King Herring and posthumously to each of Charles "Charlie" Wilson and Gustav Lascaris "Gust" Avrakotos, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service to the country; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. RICE of

South Carolina, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 439. A bill to suspend foreign assistance to certain countries related to unlawful migration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 440. A bill to ensure that long-term unemployed individuals are not taken into account for purposes of the employer health care coverage mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 441. A bill to provide for a technical change to the Medicare long-term care hospital moratorium exception; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 442. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to extend the coverage of the Federal prohibition against hate crimes in order to provide greater protections to persons who are gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 443. A bill to streamline the collection and distribution of government information; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 444. A bill to expand the research and education on and delivery of complementary and alternative medicine to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 445. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that scientific studies used in a rule making be published, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MENG, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 446. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 447. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reduce the limit on the amount of certain contributions which may be made to a candidate with respect to an election for Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ESTY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DOGETT, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BERA, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. BASS, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MATSUI, Ms.

DELBENE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 448. A bill to protect a woman's right to determine whether and when to bear a child or end a pregnancy by limiting restrictions on the provision of abortion services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 449. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to make student loans dischargeable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 450. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit criminal corporations from making disbursements of funds in connection with a campaign for election for Federal, State, or local office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 451. A bill to ensure the functionality and security of new Federal websites that collect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SIRE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. UPTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. REED, and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 452. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to clarify when certain academic assessments shall be administered; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PITTS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SALMON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 453. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, to award grants on a competitive basis to public and private entities to provide qualified sexual risk avoidance education to youth and their parents; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 454. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for forgiveness of certain overpayments of retired pay paid to deceased retired members of the Armed Forces following their death; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. HIGGINS):

H.R. 455. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a northern border threat analysis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. MESSER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr.

FATTAH, Ms. LEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. YOHIO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JONES, Ms.

ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SEN-SENRENNER, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SIREN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 456. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include the cost of applying to an institution of higher learning as part of the benefits provided under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 457. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to exclude the State of New Jersey from the prohibition on professional and amateur sports gambling to the extent approved by the legislature of the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 458. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to permit multiemployer plans in critical status to modify plan rules relating to withdrawal liability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. PITTENGER):

H.R. 459. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish goals for an all-of-the-above energy production plan strategy on a 4-year basis on all onshore Federal lands managed by the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. PITTENGER):

H.R. 460. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. HANNA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. JONES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COLE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr.

WALZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. NUGENT):

H.R. 461. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the donation of wild game meat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. FARR, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.J. Res. 23. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify the authority of Congress and the States to regulate corporations, limited liability companies or other corporate entities established by the laws of any State, the United States, or any foreign state; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.J. Res. 24. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the authority of Congress and the States to regulate political campaign contributions and expenditures, including independent expenditures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BASS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. HONDA):

H.J. Res. 25. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. LEE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SIREN, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California):

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of No Name-Calling Week in bringing attention to name-calling of all kinds and providing schools with the tools and inspiration to launch an on-going dialogue about ways to eliminate name-calling and bullying in their communities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FOX:

H. Res. 39. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 40. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H. Res. 41. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Government should not bail out State and local government employee pension plans or other plans that provide post-employment benefits to State and local government retirees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TONKO, Mrs.

CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H. Res. 43. A resolution expressing the sense of the House recognizing and honoring the Fire Department of New York; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. KING of New York introduced a bill (H.R. 462) for the relief of Alemseghed Mussie Tesfaimal; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 7.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress's Power under the Spending Clause in Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 20.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of our Land and Naval Forces.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congressional power to provide for public financing of campaigns arises under the General Welfare Clause, Art. I, Sec. 8, of the Constitution.

In *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 91 (1976), the Supreme Court upheld the congressional power to enact public financing of presidential elections under this Clause. The Supreme Court stated with regard to the provisions in the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974 establishing a presidential public financing system, "In this case, Congress was legislating for the 'general welfare'—to reduce the deleterious influence of large contributions on our political process, to facilitate communication by candidates with the electorate, and to free candidates from the rigors of fundraising."

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 that states that Congress shall have the Power “To make all Laws which shall be necessary for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

Additionally, Section 1 of the XIV Amendment states, “. . . nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. . .” and under Section 5 of the XIV Amendment, “The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.”

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution, including the power granted Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, of the United States Constitution, and the power granted to each House of Congress under Article I, Section 5, Clause 2, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this bill is Section 4 of Article I, which gives Congress the power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to amend any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power “To establish Post Offices and post Roads.”

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached legislation falls under Congress’ enumerated constitutional authority to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to Article I, Section 8, clause 3.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, and to regulate commerce as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution provides that “The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.”

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 1 and Article 1, Section 9.

“All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.”

“No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.”

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Clause 8, Section 18.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 gives Congress the power to make all laws necessary and proper to carry into execution the preceding enumerated powers. It is necessary and proper for Congress to eliminate the National Technical Information Service in the Department of Commerce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3: “The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Sec. 8, Clause 3: “The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 and Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 18 in section 7 of section of article 1 of the Constitution of the United States, which states: The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which states the Congress shall have the power “to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof”

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8—to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution.

Article I, Sec. 9—no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution (relating to Congress' power to regulate commerce . . . among the several states . . .). The United States Congress initially enacted ERISA under the Commerce Clause in order to stabilize employee pension plans that employees carry with them across state lines. This bill modifies ERISA and is thus a regulation of commerce—specifically pension plans—among more than one state.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section 3 clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XIII Section 1, "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction." Section 2, "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.J. Res. 23.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.J. Res. 24.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution: "The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate."

By Mr. POCAN:

H.J. Res. 25.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States, which states:

The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 38: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 90: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 114: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 131: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 132: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. YODER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 139: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 143: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 146: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 148: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 153: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 154: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LOESACK, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 159: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 167: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 169: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 173: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 187: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. LOESACK.

H.R. 197: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 199: Mr. WALZ and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 204: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 210: Mr. MESSER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 217: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 223: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 243: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 247: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 270: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 275: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 283: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 284: Mr. FORBES and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 285: Mr. ROSKAM and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 290: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 291: Mr. O'ROURKE and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 333: Mr. AMODEI, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 344: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 350: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LATTA, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 351: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 353: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NUGENT, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 357: Mr. KLINE and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 367: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 383: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 386: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 388: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 393: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 399: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 401: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. COOK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 402: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 403: Ms. MOORE, Mr. FARR, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 414: Mr. KING of New York.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. YOHO.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. WALZ, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H. Res. 14: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 34: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 35: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H. Res. 36: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. ROSLEHTINEN.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 416: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.